arXiv:math/0507358v2 [math.AP] 18 Jul 2005

CRITICAL ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS IN POTENTIAL FORM

EMMANUEL HEBEY

Abstract. Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian n-manifold, $n \ge 3$. Let also $p \ge 1$ be an integer, and $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ be the vector space of symmetrical $p\times p$ real matrix. For $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ smooth, $A = (A_{ij})$, we consider vector valued equations, or systems, like

$$\Delta_g^p \mathcal{U} + A(x)\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2^\star} D_{\mathcal{U}} |\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star} ,$$

where $\mathcal{U} : M \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is a p-map, Δ_g^p is the Laplace-Beltrami operator acting on p-maps, and $2^\star$ is critical from the Sobolev viewpoint. We investigate various questions for this equation, like the existence of minimizing solutions, the existence of high energy solutions, blow-up theory, and compactness. We provide the complete H_1^2-theory for blow-up, sharp pointwise estimates, and prove compactness when the equations are not trivially coupled and of geometric type.

Contents

1. Preliminary definitions and remarks 3
2. Minimizing solutions and variational structure 6
3. High energy solutions 14
4. The H_1^2-theory for blow-up 17
5. Pointwise estimates 25
6. L^2-concentration 31
7. Sharp pointwise asymptotics 38
8. Standard rescaling 54
9. Pseudo-compactness and compactness 59
References 71

Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian n-manifold, $n \ge 3$. Let also $p \ge 1$ be an integer, and $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ be the vector space of symmetrical $p \times p$ real matrix. Namely the vector space of $p\times p$ real matrix $S = (S_{ij})$ which are such that $S_{ij} = S_{ji}$ for all i, j. For $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ smooth, $A = (A_{ij})$, we consider vector valued equations like

$$\Delta_g^p \mathcal{U} + A(x)\mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2^\star} D_{\mathcal{U}} |\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star} , \tag{0.1}$$

where $\mathcal{U} : M \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is a map, sometimes referred to as a p-map to underline the fact that the target space is $\mathbb{R}^p$, Δ_g^p is the Laplace-Beltrami operator acting on p-maps, $2^\star = 2n/(n-2)$, and $D_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the derivation operator with respect to $\mathcal{U}$. Writing that $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, we have that $|\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star} = \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i|^{2^\star}$, that $\frac{1}{2^\star} D_{\mathcal{U}}|\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star} = \left(|u_i|^{2^\star-2}u_i\right)_i$,

---

Date: July 18, 2005.

and that $\Delta_g^p \mathcal{U} = (\Delta_g u_i)_i$, where $i = 1, \ldots, p$, and $\Delta_g = -\mathrm{div}_g \nabla$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator for functions. Another way we can write (0.1) is like in the following elliptic system in potential form:

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \ , \tag{0.2}$$

where the equations have to be satisfied in M, and for all $i = 1, \ldots, p$. We say the system is of order p, and refer to it as a p-system. The system has a variational structure. It is also critical from the Sobolev viewpoint since, if H_1^2 is the Sobolev space of functions in L^2 with one derivative in L^2, then $2^\star$ is the critical Sobolev exponent for the embeddings of H_1^2 into Lebesgue spaces. When $p = 1$, (0.2) reduces to Yamabe type equations like

$$\Delta_g u + h(x) u = |u|^{2^\star - 2} u \ , \tag{0.3}$$

where $h : M \to \mathbb{R}$, $h = A_{11}$, is smooth. In the same order of ideas, if A is diagonal, then (0.2) consists of p copies of Yamabe type equations like (0.3) with $h = A_{ii}$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$. When A is diagonal, the equations are independent one from another, and the system is said to be trivial, or trivially coupled.

Equations like (0.1) generalize the intensively studied Yamabe type equations. In this paper we study various questions for (0.1), like the existence of minimizing solutions for (0.1), the existence of high energy solutions, blow-up theory, and compactness properties of (0.1). Section 1 of the paper is devoted to preliminary definitions and remarks on our systems. We insist in this section on some of the differences we can find between the scalar case (where $p = 1$) and the vector valued case addressed in this paper (where $p \geq 2$). A major difference is the lack of maximum principle. We exhibit in Section 1 examples of nonnegative solutions of systems like (0.1) which are not positive. In other words, examples of solutions such that the factors of the solutions are nonnegative, nonzero, but with zeros in M – a phenomenon which does not occur when $p = 1$ (where, by the maximum principle, nonnegative solutions are either identically zero or everywhere positive). In Section 2 of the paper we discuss the variational structure attached to our systems. In particular, we prove that if the minimum energy of the system is sufficiently small, then the system possesses a minimizing solution (of small energy). The existence of high energy solutions is discussed in Section 3. Blow-up theory for our systems and for nonnegative solutions is discussed in Sections 4 to 8. We adopt in these sections the dynamical viewpoint (in the sense of the terminology introduced in [23]) which consists in considering sequences of solutions (or Palais-Smale sequences) of families of equations and not only sequences of solutions (or Palais-Smale sequences) of one given equation (in our case, of families of systems and not of one given system). The H_1^2-theory for blow-up is discussed in Section 4. We provide in this section a complete description of the asymptotic behaviour of Palais-Smale sequences in the Sobolev space $H_{1,p}^2$ consisting of p-maps whose components are in L^2 with one derivative in L^2. Global pointwise estimates for sequences of solutions are discussed in Section 5. We prove that we can add pointwise estimates to the Sobolev asymptotics of the H_1^2-theory when passing from Palais-Smale sequences to sequences of solutions. The notion of L^2-concentration, which turns out to be important for compactness issues, is addressed in Section 6. In Section 7 we prove sharp local pointwise estimates for sequences of solutions. Standard rescaling is discussed in Section 8. The blow-up theory developed in Sections 4 to 8 is applied in Section 9 to get compactness results in the conformally flat case. Roughly speaking, we prove that, for conformally flat manifolds, systems like (0.1) are compact when their coupling does not involve a trivial coupling related to the geometric equation.

1. Preliminary definitions and remarks

In what follows we let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, be a smooth map from M to $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$. We consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x) u_j = \Lambda |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{1.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$, where $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We let $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ be the space consisting of p-maps $\mathcal{U} : M \to \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, such that the u_i's are all in the standard Sobolev space $H_1^2(M)$. Namely,

$$H_{1,p}^2(M) = \Big\{ \mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)\ ,\ u_i \in H_1^2(M) \text{ for all } i \Big\}\ ,$$

where $H_1^2(M)$ is the standard Sobolev space of functions in $L^2(M)$ with one derivative in L^2. The space $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ is an Hilbert space when equipped with the scalar product

$$\langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \rangle_{H_{1,p}^2} = \sum_i (u_i, v_i)\ ,$$

where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the usual scalar product in $H_1^2(M)$, the u_i's are the components of $\mathcal{U}$, and the v_i's are the components of $\mathcal{V}$. A map $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ is said to be a weak solution of (1.1) if the equations in (1.1) are satisfied in the distributional sense by the u_i's. By regularity theory (see the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Section 2), any weak solution $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ of (1.1), $\mathcal{U} \in H_{1,p}^2(M)$, is in $C^{2,\theta}$ for all $0 < \theta < 1$ (in the sense that the u_i's are in $C^{2,\theta}$ for all i).

In what follows we say that a p-map $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is *nonnegative* if the u_i's are all nonnegative functions (i.e $u_i \geq 0$ for all i), *weakly positive* if the u_i's are all positive functions unless they are identically zero (i.e, for any i, either $u_i > 0$ or $u_i \equiv 0$), and *strongly positive* if the u_i's are all positive functions (i.e $u_i > 0$ for all i). For short, a p-map is said to be *positive* if it is either weakly positive, or strongly positive. Following standard terminology in the elliptic system literature, we say that a matrix $S = (S_{ij})$ is *cooperative* if $S_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$. If $S : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ is a map, S is said to be cooperative in M if $S_{ij}(x) \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and all $x \in M$. At last, still following standard terminology in the elliptic system literature, we say that the system (1.1) is *fully coupled* if the index set $\{1, \dots, p\}$ does not split in two disjoint subsets $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_{k'}\}$, $k + k' = p$, such that $A_{i_\alpha j_\beta} \equiv 0$ for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, k$ and $\beta = 1, \dots, k'$. When (1.1) is not fully coupled, up to permuting the equations, A can be written in diagonal blocks $S : M \to M_k^s(\mathbb{R})$ and $T : M \to M_{p-k}^s(\mathbb{R})$ for some $k < p$, like in (1.8) below, and the p-system splits in two independent systems. Namely a k-system with respect to S and a $(p-k)$-system with respect to T. If $\mathcal{U} = (u_i)_i$ is a solution of (1.1), and σ is a permutation of $\Sigma_p = \{1, \dots, p\}$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = (u_{\sigma(i)})_i$ is a solution of (1.1) when we replace the A_{ij}'s by $\tilde{A}_{ij} = A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$. Possible references on elliptic systems are De Figueiredo

[11], De Figueiredo and Ding [12], De Figueiredo and Felmer [13], El Hamidi [21], Hulshof, Mitidieri and Van der Vorst [30], Mancini and Mitidieri [39], Mitidieri and Sweers [41], and Sweers [52].

In Remarks 1.1 and 1.2 below we discuss two important examples which show that nonnegative solutions of systems like (1.1) are not necessarily weakly positive, and, in the same order of ideas, that weakly positive solutions of systems like (1.1) are not necessarily strongly positive.

Remark 1.1: Contrary to the case $p = 1$, nonnegative solutions of a system like (1.1) are not necessarily weakly positive (and thus not necessarily strongly positive as well). We may have a nonnegative solution $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ with one of the u_i's non identically zero, but with zeros in M. A possible construction when $p = 2$ is as follows. We let (S^n, g_0) be the unit n-sphere. The Yamabe equation on (S^n, g_0) reads as

$$\Delta_{g_0} u + \frac{n(n-2)}{4} u = u^{2^\star - 1} \tag{1.2}$$

and the positive solutions of (1.2) are given by

$$u_{x_0}^\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{n(n-2)}{4}(\lambda^2 - 1)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{4}} \left(\lambda - \cos d_{g_0}(x_0, x)\right)^{1 - \frac{n}{2}} \ , \tag{1.3}$$

where $\lambda > 1$ and $x_0 \in S^n$. We fix $x_0 \in S^n$ and let $u_\lambda = u_{x_0}^\lambda$. Then

$$u_\lambda = \left(\frac{n(n-2)}{4}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{4}} + \varepsilon_\lambda \tag{1.4}$$

where $\varepsilon_\lambda \to 0$ in $C^0(S^n)$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$. Let $m_\lambda = \min_{S^n} u_\lambda$. Let also $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\lambda$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_\lambda$ be the functions given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varepsilon}_\lambda(x) &= \frac{u_\lambda(x) - m_\lambda}{u_\lambda(x)} \ , \text{ and} \\ \hat{\varepsilon}_\lambda(x) &= \frac{n(n-2)}{4} - u_\lambda(x)^{2^\star - 2} + \frac{\left(u_\lambda(x) - m_\lambda\right)^{2^\star - 1}}{u_\lambda(x)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

where $x \in S^n$. By (1.4), $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\lambda \to 0$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_\lambda \to 0$ in $C^0(S^n)$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$ while, by (1.2), letting $u_1^\lambda = u_\lambda - m_\lambda$ and $u_2^\lambda = u_\lambda$, we easily get that $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = (u_1^\lambda, u_2^\lambda)$ is a solution of the 2-system

$$\Delta_{g_0} u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{ij}^\lambda(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{1.6}$$

in S^n, for all $i = 1, 2$, if $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\lambda A_{11}^\lambda + A_{12}^\lambda = \hat{\varepsilon}_\lambda$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\lambda A_{21}^\lambda + A_{22}^\lambda = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$. Let $A_{11}^\lambda = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$. Then the 2-map $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = (u_1^\lambda, u_2^\lambda)$ is a solution of (1.6) for all λ, where $A^\lambda = (A_{ij}^\lambda)$ can be chosen in the form

$$A^\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n(n-2)}{4} & \varepsilon'_\lambda \\ \varepsilon'_\lambda & \frac{n(n-2)}{4} + \varepsilon''_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{1.7}$$

and where $\varepsilon'_\lambda \to 0$ and $\varepsilon''_\lambda \to 0$ in $C^0(S^n)$ as $\lambda \to +\infty$. Obviously, $u_1^\lambda = u_\lambda - m_\lambda$ is nonnegative with one zero (at $-x_0$). In particular, $\mathcal{U}_\lambda = (u_1^\lambda, u_2^\lambda)$ is not weakly positive. However, $\mathcal{U}_\lambda$ is a nonnegative solution of the 2-system (1.6). Summarizing, we constructed a nonnegative solution of a system like (1.1) with one factor in the solution which is non identically zero, but has zeros in M. This shows that nonnegative solutions of systems like (1.1) are not necessarily weakly positive. By (1.7), for $\lambda > 1$ sufficiently large, A^λ is positive and the operator $\Delta_{g_0}^2 + A^\lambda$ is coercive (coercivity is defined in Section 2). Of course, (1.6) is also fully coupled since, if not, the maximum principle for functions would lead to a contradiction.

Remark 1.2: In a similar way, weakly positive solutions of a system like (1.1) are not necessarily strongly positive. There is of course a trivial construction where we create 0-factors by adding "artificial" equations to the system. For instance, if $\mathcal{U}$ is a solution of (1.1) with $\Lambda = 1$, then we may regard the map $(\mathcal{U}, 0)$, $0 \in \mathbb{R}$, as a solution of the system (1.1)–(0.3) we get by adding to (1.1) one equation like (0.3). In such constructions, the resulting system is obviousy not fully coupled. However, there are easy examples of fully coupled systems with weakly positive solutions having zero factors (and thus with weakly positive solutions which are not strongly positive). To get such examples we may consider a positive solution u of an equation like (0.3), and note that $\mathcal{U} = (u, u, 0)$ is a solution of (1.1) with $p = 3$ (and $\Lambda = 1$) when the A_{ij}'s are such that $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$, $A_{11} + A_{12} = h$, $A_{21} + A_{22} = h$, and $A_{13} = -A_{23}$. For instance, if u is a positive solution of (0.3), then $\mathcal{U} = (u, u, 0)$ is a solution of (1.1) with $p = 3$ and $\Lambda = 1$, when

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}h & \frac{1}{2}h & \alpha \\ \frac{1}{2}h & \frac{1}{2}h & -\alpha \\ \alpha & -\alpha & \beta \end{pmatrix} ,$$

h is as in (0.3), and α, β are arbitrary functions. The system is obviously fully coupled when α is nonzero.

The following lemma, that we will use several times in the sequel, shows that the above examples in Remarks 1.1 and 1.2 stop to hold, or reduce to the trivial case, when $-A$ is cooperative, respectively when $-A$ is cooperative and the system is also fully coupled.

Lemma 1.1. *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, $p \ge 1$ integer, and $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, be a smooth map from M to $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$. If $-A$ is cooperative, then any nonnegative solution of (1.1) is weakly positive. If $-A$ is cooperative and (1.1) is fully coupled, then any weakly positive solution of (1.1) is strongly positive.*

Proof. If $-A$ is cooperative, and $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is a solution of (1.1), we can write that

$$\Delta_g u_i + A_{ii} u_i \ge \Lambda u_i^{2^\star - 1}$$

for all i. Then the classical maximum principle for scalar equations can be applied so that either $u_i > 0$ everywhere in M, or $u_i \equiv 0$. This proves the first assertion in the lemma. Concerning the second assertion, we prove that if $-A$ (or A) is cooperative, and $\mathcal{U}$ is a weakly positive solution of the system, then A can be factorized in blocs with respect to the zero and nonzero components of $\mathcal{U}$. More precisely, if we write $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_k, 0, \dots, 0)$ with $k < p$, and $u_i > 0$ for all i, then

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1.8}$$

where $S : M \to M_k^s(\mathbb{R})$, $T : M \to M_{p-k}^s(\mathbb{R})$, and the 0's are null matrix of respective order $k \times (p-k)$ and $(p-k) \times k$. This easily follows from the equations $\sum_{j=1}^k A_{ij} u_j = 0$ for all $i \ge k+1$, so that we necessarily have that $A_{ij} = 0$ for all

$i \geq k+1$ and $j \leq k$. The p-system (1.1) splits into two independent systems – a k-system where A is replaced by S, and a $(p-k)$-system where A is replaced by T. In particular, if $-A$ is cooperative and (1.1) is fully coupled, any weakly positive solution of (1.1) is strongly positive. □

Remark 1.3 below is concerned with the negative case where $\Lambda < 0$ in (1.1). With respect to scalar equations (where $p = 1$) we loose uniqueness but still have the a priori L^∞-bound. Like when $p = 1$, the difficult case in equations like (1.1), with respect to existence or compactness of solutions, is when Λ is positive.

Remark 1.3: There are different behaviour of (1.1) depending on the sign of Λ. In the negative case, when $\Lambda < 0$, the positive solution is known to be unique if $p = 1$. This obviously stops to hold for systems and there are counter examples involving only constant maps, and so only algebra. Suppose for instance that $p = 2$ and $n = 6$. Let $\lambda > 0$, $u_\lambda = \lambda$, $v_\lambda = \lambda + 1$, and $w_\lambda = (\lambda^2 + (\lambda+1)^2)/(2\lambda+1)$. Let also $A_{11}(\lambda)$, $A_{22}(\lambda)$, and $A_{12}(\lambda) = A_{21}(\lambda)$ be given by $A_{11}(\lambda) = A_{22}(\lambda) = -(3\lambda^2 + 3\lambda + 1)/(2\lambda+1)$ and $A_{12}(\lambda) = (\lambda^2 + \lambda)/(2\lambda + 1)$. Then, for any $\lambda > 0$, (u_λ, v_λ), (v_λ, u_λ), and (w_λ, w_λ) are three distinct strongly positive solutions of (1.1) with $\Lambda = -1$ and $A = A(\lambda)$, where $A(\lambda)$ is the matrix of components $A_{ij}(\lambda)$, $i, j = 1, 2$. However, though uniqueness is not anymore true for systems, it is still true, like when $p = 1$, that there is a bound (depending only on A and Λ) for the L^∞-norm of positive solutions of the system. If $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is a positive solution of (1.1) with $\Lambda < 0$, and x_i is a point where u_i is maximum, then $\Delta_g u_i(x_i) \geq 0$ and we get with the equations in (1.1) that

$$\|u_i\|_\infty^{2^\star - 1} \leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\|A\|_\infty \max_{j=1,\dots,p} \|u_j\|_\infty$$

for all i, where $\|A\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} \|A_{ij}\|_\infty$. In particular, there exists $C = C(\|A\|_\infty, \Lambda)$, $C > 0$ depending only on $\|A\|_\infty$ and Λ, such that $\|u_i\|_\infty \leq C$ for all i.

2. Minimizing solutions and variational structure

By the Sobolev inequality in Euclidean space, there exists $K > 0$ such that $\|u\|_{2^\star} \leq K\|\nabla u\|_2$ for all smooth functions u with compact support in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We let K_n be the sharp constant K in this inequality, so that

$$K_n = \sqrt{\frac{4}{n(n-2)\omega_n^{2/n}}}\ , \tag{2.1}$$

where ω_n is the volume of the unit n-sphere. A preliminary claim is that we also have that

$$K_n^{-2} = \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}^p_{\mathbb{R}^n}} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_i|^2 dx \tag{2.2}$$

for all $p \geq 1$, where $\mathcal{H}^p_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ consists of the maps $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, $u_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, which are such that $u_i \in D_1^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all i, and $\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_i|^{2^\star} dx = 1$, where $D_1^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Beppo-Levi space defined as the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the space of smooth function with compact support in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with respect to the norm $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_2$. When $p = 1$, (2.2) is obvious since it reduces to the basic definition of the sharp constant K in the inequality $\|u\|_{2^\star} \leq K\|\nabla u\|_2$. That (2.2) is also true for $p > 1$ was first noticed by Amster, De Nápoli and Mariani [1]. Let Λ_p be the right hand side in (2.2). Taking $\mathcal{U} = (u, 0, \dots, 0)$, we easily get that $\Lambda_p \le \Lambda_1$. Conversely, since $2/2^\star < 1$, so that $(\sum |a_i|)^{2/2^\star} \le \sum |a_i|^{2/2^\star}$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u_i|^{2^\star} dx\right)^{2/2^\star} &\le \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_i|^2 dx\right)^{2^\star/2}\right)^{2/2^\star} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\Lambda_1}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u_i|^2 dx\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

and it follows that we also have that $\Lambda_p \ge \Lambda_1$. This proves the above claim that (2.2) is true for all p. Now, we return to the case of manifolds. For (M, g) a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, and $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$ smooth, we let $I_A : H_{1,p}^2(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the functional given by

$$I_A(\mathcal{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}(x) u_i u_j dv_g \ , \tag{2.4}$$

where $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ is as in Section 1. Let also $\Phi : H_{1,p}^2(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ be the functional given by $\Phi(\mathcal{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g$. The definition of Φ makes sense thanks to the Sobolev embedding of H_1^2 into $L^{2^\star}$. We define $\mu_{A,g}^p(M)$ by

$$\mu_{A,g}^p(M) = \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}_M^p} I_A(\mathcal{U}) \ , \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_M^p$ consists of the maps $\mathcal{U} \in H_{1,p}^2(M)$ which satisfy the constraint $\Phi(\mathcal{U}) = 1$. Let $S : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function, and Id_p be the $p \times p$-identity matrix. We let $\mu_{S,g}^1(M)$ be the infimum $\mu_{SId_1,g}^1(M)$. An easy claim in the spirit of (2.2) is that

$$\mu_{SId_p,g}^p(M) = \mu_{S,g}^1(M) \tag{2.6}$$

if S is such that $\mu_{S,g}^1(M) \ge 0$ (for instance $S \ge 0$). In order to prove this claim, we first note that, taking $\mathcal{U} = (u, 0, \dots, 0)$ in (2.5), we get that $\mu_{SId_p,g}^p(M) \le \mu_{S,g}^1(M)$. We assume $\mu_{S,g}^1(M) \ge 0$. It follows that we also have that $\mu_{SId_p,g}^p(M) \ge 0$. In particular, if $\mu_{S,g}^1(M) = 0$, then $\mu_{SId_p,g}^p(M) = 0$, and (2.6) is true in this case. Let us now assume that $\mu_{S,g}^1(M) > 0$. As in (2.3), we may write that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} \\ &\le \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{S,g}^1(M)}\int_M \left(|\nabla u_i|^2 + S u_i^2\right) dv_g\right)^{2^\star/2}\right)^{2/2^\star} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\mu_{S,g}^1(M)}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M \left(|\nabla u_i|^2 + S u_i^2\right) dv_g\end{aligned}$$

and we get that $I_{SId_p}(\mathcal{U}) \ge \mu_{S,g}^1(M)\Phi(\mathcal{U})^{2/2^\star}$ for all maps $\mathcal{U} \in H_{1,p}^2(M)$, where I_A is given by (2.4), and Φ is as in the definition of $\mathcal{H}_M^p$ in (2.5). As a consequence we get that $\mu_{SId_p,g}^p(M) \ge \mu_{S,g}^1(M)$, and this proves the above claim that (2.6) is true when $\mu_{S,g}^1(M) \ge 0$. In particular, if $A_g = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g Id_p$, where S_g is the scalar curvature of g, and if the Yamabe invariant $Y_{[g]}(M)$ of (M, g) is nonnegative, then

$\mu^p_{A_g,g}(M) = Y_{[g]}(M)$. For instance, if (S^n, g_0) is the unit n-sphere, then, similarly to (2.2), we can also write that $K_n^{-2} = \mu^p_{A_{g_0},g_0}(S^n)$ for all p. A possible survey reference for the Yamabe material we used here is Lee and Parker [34]. We refer also to Aubin [5], Hebey [24], and Schoen [48].

When $\mu^1_{S,g}(M) < 0$ and $p > 1$, an equation like $\mu^p_{SId_p,g}(M) = \mu^1_{S,g}(M)$ stops to hold and we do get that $\mu^p_{SId_p,g}(M) < \mu^1_{S,g}(M)$. In order to see this, we let $u > 0$ be a minimizer for $\mu^1_{S,g}(M)$, and let $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$ be the p-map given by $\mathcal{U} = \left(p^{-1/2^\star}u, \dots, p^{-1/2^\star}u\right)$. Then $\Phi(\mathcal{U}) = 1$, where Φ is as in the definition of $\mathcal{H}^p_M$ in (2.5), and it follows from (2.4) that $I_{SId_p}(\mathcal{U}) = p^{1-(2/2^\star)}\mu^1_{S,g}(M)$. In particular, $\mu^p_{SId_p,g}(M) < \mu^1_{S,g}(M)$ when $p > 1$ and $\mu^1_{S,g}(M) < 0$.

As in Section 1, we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, be a smooth map, and we consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x)u_j = \Lambda|u_i|^{2^\star-2}u_i \tag{2.7}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$, where $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim here that the following theorem holds. The case $p = 1$ in the result is well known and goes back to Aubin [4] and Trudinger [53] (see also Yamabe [56]). Note that by considering test functions $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$ for I_A in the form $\mathcal{U} = (u, 0, \dots, 0)$, we easily get from the $p = 1$ case that $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) \leq K_n^{-2}$ for all A and all (M, g).

Theorem 2.1 (Existence of Minimizers). *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$, and $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$ be a smooth map. Assume $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) < K_n^{-2}$, where $\mu^p_{A,g}(M)$ is given by (2.5), and K_n is given by (2.1). Then there exists a minimizer $\mathcal{U}$ for $\mu^p_{A,g}(M)$. Namely, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}^p_M$ and $I_A(\mathcal{U}) = \mu^p_{A,g}(M)$, where I_A is given by (2.4), and $\mathcal{H}^p_M$ is as in (2.5). In particular, $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is a minimizing solution of the system (2.7) with $\Lambda = \mu^p_{A,g}(M)$. The u_i's are in $C^{2,\theta}$ for all i and $0 < \theta < 1$. The solution $\mathcal{U}$ can be chosen weakly positive if $-A$ is cooperative in M, and strongly positive if the system is also fully coupled.*

Proof. First we prove the existence of a minimizer $\mathcal{U}$ for $\mu^p_{A,g}(M)$ when we assume that $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) < K_n^{-2}$. Then we prove the regularity of weak solutions, not necessarily minimizing, of systems like (2.7). Concerning the existence of $\mathcal{U}$, we let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a minimizing sequence for $\mu^p_{A,g}(M)$, and write that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$ for all α. Since $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}^p_M$ for all α, the u^i_α's are uniformly bounded in $H^2_1(M)$ for all i. Up to passing to a subsequence, we may therefore assume that, for any i, $u^i_\alpha \rightharpoonup u_i$ weakly in $H^2_1(M)$, $u^i_\alpha \to u_i$ strongly in $L^2(M)$, and $u^i_\alpha \to u_i$ almost everywhere in M. By the weak convergence in H^2_1,

$$\int_M |\nabla u^i_\alpha|^2 dv_g = \int_M |\nabla(u^i_\alpha - u_i)|^2 dv_g + \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g + o(1) \tag{2.8}$$

for all i, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We also have, for instance by Brézis and Lieb [7], that

$$\int_M |u^i_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_M |u^i_\alpha - u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g + \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1) \tag{2.9}$$

for all i and α, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Moreover, by the sharp Sobolev inequality in Hebey and Vaugon [28, 29], we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\int_M \sum_{i=1}^p |u_\alpha^i - u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star}\\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\int_M |u_\alpha^i - u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} \qquad (2.10)\\ &\le K_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla(u_\alpha^i - u_i)|^2 dv_g + B \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_\alpha^i - u_i|^2 dv_g\end{aligned}$$

for all i and α, where $B > 0$ does not depend on i and α. Then, since $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_M^p$ for all α, we get by combining (2.8)–(2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star}\\ &\le K_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g - \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g\right) + o(1)\end{aligned} \qquad (2.11)$$

for all i and α, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Since $I_A(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = \mu_{A,g}^p(M) + o(1)$ for all α, and $u_\alpha^i \to u_i$ in $L^2(M)$ for all i, we get with (2.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star}\\ &\le K_n^2 \left(\mu_{A,g}^p(M) - I_A(\mathcal{U})\right) + o(1) \qquad (2.12)\\ &\le K_n^2 \mu_{A,g}^p(M) \left(1 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star}\right) + o(1)\end{aligned}$$

for all α, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the p-map whose components are the u_i's, $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and we used the equation

$$I_A(\mathcal{U}) \ge \mu_{A,g}^p(M) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \|u_i\|_{2^\star}^{2^\star}\right)^{2/2^\star} .$$

Noting that

$$0 \le 1 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} \le \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star}$$

for all α, we get with (2.12) that

$$K_n^2 \mu_{A,g}^p(M) < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g = 1 . \qquad (2.13)$$

In particular, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}_M^p$, and then, by writing with (2.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^p \left(\int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g - \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g\right) \\
&= I_A(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) - I_A(\mathcal{U}) + o(1) \\
&\le \mu_{A,g}^p(M) - \mu_{A,g}^p(M)\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} + o(1) \\
&= o(1)\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

we get with (2.8) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla(u_\alpha^i - u_i)|^2 dv_g \to 0 \tag{2.14}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By (2.14), $u_\alpha^i \to u_i$ strongly in $H_1^2(M)$ for all i, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, $I_A(\mathcal{U}) = \mu_{A,g}^p(M)$, and since $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}_M^p$, $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is a minimizer for $\mu_{A,g}^p(M)$. If $-A$ is cooperative, $I_A(|\mathcal{U}|) \le I_A(\mathcal{U})$ where $|\mathcal{U}| = (|u_1|, \dots, |u_p|)$. In particular, if $-A$ is cooperative, up to replacing $\mathcal{U}$ by $|\mathcal{U}|$, we can choose $\mathcal{U}$ to be nonnegative. Independently, we clearly have that $\mathcal{U}$ is a weak solution of the system (2.7) with $\Lambda = \mu_{A,g}^p(M)$, in the sense that for any $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$, and any i,

$$\int_M (\nabla u_i \nabla \varphi_i) dv_g + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij} u_i \varphi_j dv_g = \Lambda |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \varphi_i\ . \tag{2.15}$$

Now we prove the regularity of $\mathcal{U}$, and more generally of any solution of (2.15). Here we follow the arguments developed by Trudinger [53] for the Yamabe equation. By standard elliptic theory, it suffices to prove that the u_i's are all in $L^q(M)$ for some $q > 2^\star$. For $\lambda > 0$ we let F_λ and G_λ be real functions defined by

$$\begin{cases} F_\lambda(x) = |x|^{p_0} \ \text{ if } |x| \le \lambda \\ \\ F_\lambda(x) = p_0 \lambda^{p_0 - 1}|x| - (p_0 - 1)\lambda^{p_0} \ \text{ if not} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} G_\lambda(x) = |x|^{p_1} \ \text{ if } |x| \le \lambda \\ \\ G_\lambda(x) = p_0 \lambda^{2(p_0 - 1)}|x| - (p_0 - 1)\lambda^{2p_0 - 1} \ \text{ if not}\ , \end{cases} \tag{2.17}$$

where $2p_0 = 2^\star$ and $p_1 = 2^\star - 1$ so that $2p_0 = p_1 + 1$. For $i = 1, \dots, p$, we let also

$$u_{i,\lambda}^1 = F_\lambda(u_i) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{i,\lambda}^2 = G_\lambda(u_i)\ .$$

Noting that F_λ and G_λ in (2.16) and (2.17) are Lipschitz functions, we get that the $u_{i,\lambda}^1$'s and $u_{i,\lambda}^2$'s are all in $H_1^2(M)$. Independently, we also have that for any $x \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &F_\lambda(x) \le x^{p_0}\ ,\ G_\lambda(x) \le x^{p_1}\ ,\ F_\lambda(x)^2 \ge x G_\lambda(x) \\ &\text{and } F_\lambda'(x)^2 \le p_0 G_\lambda'(x) \text{ if } x \ne \lambda\ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Taking $\varphi_i = u_{i,\lambda}^2$ in (2.15), since $u_i \in L^{2^\star}(M)$ for all i, and by (2.18), we can write that

$$\int_M G_\lambda'(u_i)|\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g \le C_1 + |\Lambda| \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star - 1} G_\lambda(u_i) dv_g \tag{2.19}$$

for all i, where $C_1 > 0$ does not depend on λ. Still by (2.18) it follows from (2.19) that

$$\frac{1}{p_0}\int_M |\nabla u^1_{i,\lambda}|^2 dv_g \le C_1 + |\Lambda| \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g \ . \tag{2.20}$$

Given $K > 0$ we let

$$H^1_{i,K} = \left\{x \text{ s.t. } |u_i(x)| \le K\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad H^2_{i,K} = \left\{x \text{ s.t. } |u_i(x)| \ge K\right\} \ .$$

By Hölder's inequality, and the Sobolev inequality for the embedding $H^2_1 \subset L^{2^\star}$, namely $\|\varphi\|_{2^\star} \le A\|\nabla\varphi\|_{H^2_1}$ for all $\varphi \in H^2_1(M)$, we write that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_M |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g \\ &\le \int_{H^1_K} |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g + \int_{H^2_K} |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g \\ &\le \int_{H^1_K} |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g + \left(\int_{H^2_K} |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/n} \left(\int_M F_\lambda(u_i)^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} \\ &\le \int_{H^1_K} |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g + \varepsilon_{i,K}^{2/n} A^2 \int_M \left(|\nabla u^1_{i,\lambda}|^2 + (u^1_{i,\lambda})^2\right) dv_g \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where, since $u_i \in L^{2^\star}(M)$, $\varepsilon_{i,K} = \int_{H^2_K} |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g$ is such that

$$\lim_{K\to+\infty} \varepsilon_{i,K} = 0 \ .$$

We let $K > 0$ be such that $p_0 A^2 \varepsilon_{i,K}^{2/n} < 1$. For $\lambda > K$,

$$\int_{H^1_K} |u_i|^{2^\star-2} F_\lambda(u_i)^2 dv_g \le K^{2(2^\star-1)} V_g \ , \tag{2.22}$$

where V_g is the volume of M with respect to g. Similarly, by (2.18), and since $u_i \in L^{2^\star}(M)$, there exists $C_2 > 0$, independent of λ, such that

$$\int_M (u^1_{i,\lambda})^2 dv_g \le C_2 \tag{2.23}$$

for all i. Inserting (2.21)–(2.23) into (2.20), and since K is such that $p_0 A^2 \varepsilon_K^{2/n} < 1$, we get that

$$\int_M |\nabla u^1_{i,\lambda}|^2 dv_g \le C_3 \ , \tag{2.24}$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is independent of λ. In particular, by (2.23), (2.24), and the Sobolev inequality, there exists $C_4 > 0$ independent of λ such that

$$\int_M (u^1_{i,\lambda})^{2^\star} dv_g \le C_4$$

for all i. Letting $\lambda \to +\infty$, it clearly follows that the u_i's are all in $L^{2^\star p_0}(M)$. Since $p_0 > 1$, we then get that the u_i's are all in $L^q(M)$ for some $q > 2^\star$. By standard elliptic theory, the u_i's are in $C^{2,\theta}(M)$, $0 < \theta < 1$, for all i. This holds for $\mathcal{U}$ minimizing or not. If we assume that $-A$ is cooperative, see Lemma 1.1 in Section 1, the maximum principle for functions applies. In particular, if $\mathcal{U}$ is minimizing, it can be chosen weakly positive since, as mentionned above, up to replacing $\mathcal{U}$ by $|\mathcal{U}|$, it can be chosen nonnegative. If the system is also fully coupled, see again Lemma

1.1 in Section 1, $\mathcal{U}$ is necessarily strongly positive when it is weakly positive. This ends the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

In what follows we say that the operator $\Delta_g^p + A$ is *coercive* if there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$I_A(\mathcal{U}) \geq K\|\mathcal{U}\|^2_{H^2_{1,p}}$$

for all $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$, where the norm in the right hand side is the norm of $H^2_{1,p}(M)$. Define $\lambda_A(g)$ to be the infimum of the $I_A(\mathcal{U})$'s for $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$, $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, such that $\sum_i \int_M u_i^2 dv_g = 1$. If $\lambda_A(g) > 0$, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} I_A(\mathcal{U}) &\geq \varepsilon I_A(\mathcal{U}) + (1-\varepsilon)\lambda_A(g)\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M u_i^2 dv_g \\ &\geq \varepsilon\|\mathcal{U}\|^2_{H^2_{1,p}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $(1-\varepsilon)\lambda_A(g)Id_p + \varepsilon A \geq \varepsilon Id_p$ in the sense of bilinear forms, and Id_p is the $p \times p$-identity matrix. In particular, $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive. Conversely, since the L^2-norm is controlled by the H^2_1-norm, we easily get that $\lambda_A(g) > 0$ if $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive. This proves that $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive if and only if $\lambda_A(g) > 0$. Noting that $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) > 0$ if and only if $\lambda_A(g) > 0$, it follows that $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) > 0$ if and only if $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive.

When $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) \leq 0$, the existence of a minimizing solution for (2.7) directly follows from Theorem 2.1. When $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) > 0$, and thus $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive, there are several situations where Theorem 2.1 can be applied. For instance, we get with the developments in Aubin [4] that if $n \geq 4$ and

$$A_{ii}(x) < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g(x)$$

for some i and some x, where S_g is the scalar curvature of g, then $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) < K_n^{-2}$. We also get that $\mu^p_{A,g}(M) < K_n^{-2}$ if $\int_M A_{ii} dv_g < K_n^{-2} V_g^{2/2^\star}$ for some i, where V_g is the volume of M with respect to g, or, by Schoen [46], if $A_{ii} \equiv \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g$ for some i, and the manifold is conformally distinct to the unit sphere. By Theorem 2.1, (2.7) with $\Lambda = 1$ possesses a minimizing solution in such cases.

Remark 2.1: The above examples involve test maps with no coupling. Namely test maps like $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ where, given some $i = 1, \dots, p$, we ask that $u_j \equiv 0$ for all $j \neq i$. There are of course several examples where coupling will help decreasing the value of I_A. Let for instance (S^n, g_0) be the unit n-sphere, $p = 2$, and A_α be the matrix

$$A_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n(n-2)}{4} & \alpha \\ \alpha & \frac{n(n-2)}{4} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where $\alpha : S^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. If $\alpha \equiv 0$, then, with the notations at the beginning of the section, $A_0 = A_{g_0}$ and we get that $\mu^2_{A_0,g_0}(S^n) = K_n^{-2}$. On the other hand, it is easily seen that $\mu^2_{A_\alpha,g_0}(S^n) < K_n^{-2}$ if $\alpha \not\equiv 0$. Indeed, if we let $u_0 > 0$ be a minimizer for the Yamabe invariant on the sphere with $\|u_0\|_{2^\star} = 1$, there is an entire family of such minimizers (including one constant function), and if we let $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon = (u_0, -\varepsilon\alpha)$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is small, then, for I_A as in (2.4), and Φ as in the definition of $\mathcal{H}_M^p$ in (2.5),

$$I_{A_\alpha}(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon) \leq \left(K_n^{-2} - 2\varepsilon\int_{S^n}\alpha^2 u_0 dv_{g_0} + Y_{S^n}(\alpha)\varepsilon^2\right)\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon)^{2/2^\star} ,$$

where

$$Y_{S^n}(\alpha) = \int_{S^n}\left(|\nabla\alpha|^2 + \frac{n(n-2)}{4}\alpha^2\right)dv_{g_0} .$$

Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that $Y_{S^n}(\alpha)\varepsilon < 2\int_{S^n}\alpha^2 u_0 dv_{g_0}$, this proves the above claim that $\mu^2_{A_\alpha,g_0}(S^n) < K_n^{-2}$ when $\alpha \not\equiv 0$.

Remark 2.2: When $p = 1$, minimizers are always positive or negative (since if u is a minimizer, then $|u|$ is also a minimizer and we can apply the maximum principle). When $p > 1$, this is not true anymore. However, in several situations, we are still dealing with positive solutions of systems like (2.7). Suppose for instance that $p = 2$, and let A, A' be the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix}\alpha & \beta\\ \beta & \gamma\end{pmatrix} \text{ and } A' = \begin{pmatrix}\alpha & -\beta\\ -\beta & \gamma\end{pmatrix} , \tag{2.25}$$

where α, β, γ are smooth functions in M, and A is supposed to be such that $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive so that $\mu(A) = \mu^2_{A,g}(M) > 0$. For $\mathcal{U} = (u, v)$ in $H^2_{1,2}(M)$ we let $\mathcal{U}'$ be given by $\mathcal{U}' = (u, -v)$. We suppose that $\beta \geq 0$, $\beta \not\equiv 0$, is nontrivial and nonnegative. If $\mathcal{U}_0 = (u_0, v_0)$ is a minimizer for $\mu(A)$, then $I_A(\mathcal{U}_0) \leq I_A(\mathcal{U}'_0)$ and we get that $\int_M \beta u_0 v_0 dv_g \leq 0$. In particular, since $\beta \geq 0$ and $\beta \not\equiv 0$, $\mathcal{U}_0$ cannot be strongly positive. Pushing further the analysis, noting that $I_A(\mathcal{U}) = I_{A'}(\mathcal{U}')$ for all $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{H}_M^p$, we easily get that $\mathcal{U}_0$ is a minimizer for $\mu(A)$ if and only if $\mathcal{U}'_0$ is a minimizer for $\mu(A') = \mu^2_{A',g}(M)$. But A' is such that $-A'$ is cooperative, so that $|\mathcal{U}'_0| = (|u_0|, |v_0|)$ is also a minimizer for $\mu(A')$. Since we assumed that $\beta \not\equiv 0$, the system is fully coupled. It follows that both $|u_0|$ and $|v_0|$ are positive functions. Summarizing, if $\beta \leq 0$, and $\beta \not\equiv 0$, $-A$ is cooperative and the system is fully coupled. Minimizers for $\mu^2_{A,g}(M)$ are like $\mathcal{U}_0 = (u_0, v_0)$ or $\mathcal{U}_0 = (-u_0, -v_0)$, where u_0 and v_0 are positive functions in M. Then, up to a positive constant scale factor, $\mathcal{U} = (u_0, v_0)$ is a strongly positive solution of the original system

$$\begin{cases}\Delta_g u_0 + \alpha u_0 + \beta v_0 = u_0^{2^\star-1}\\ \Delta_g v_0 + \beta u_0 + \gamma v_0 = v_0^{2^\star-1} .\end{cases}$$

Conversely, if $\beta \geq 0$, and $\beta \not\equiv 0$, minimizers for $\mu^2_{A,g}(M)$ are like $\mathcal{U}_0 = (u_0, -v_0)$ or $\mathcal{U}_0 = (-u_0, v_0)$, where u_0 and v_0 are positive functions in M. They are not positive (neither negative). However we are still dealing with strongly positive solutions of 2-systems. In this case, up to a positive constant scale factor, $\mathcal{U} = (u_0, v_0)$ is a strongly positive solution of the modified system

$$\begin{cases}\Delta_g u_0 + \alpha u_0 + \beta' v_0 = u_0^{2^\star-1}\\ \Delta_g v_0 + \beta' u_0 + \gamma v_0 = v_0^{2^\star-1} ,\end{cases}$$

where $\beta' = -\beta$. As one can check, the above discussion, and the arguments we developed, extend to higher order systems.

3. High energy solutions

Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold, $n \ge 3$. A preliminary remark is that there are several ways to construct positive solutions of p-systems from positive solutions of q-systems when $q < p$. Suppose for instance that we have two positive solutions of scalar equations like (0.3). Namely, $\Delta_g u + hu = u^{2^\star-1}$ and $\Delta_g v + kv = v^{2^\star-1}$ in M, where h and k are two smooth functions in M. Then $\mathcal{U} = (u,v)$ is a strongly positive solution of the 2-system

$$\begin{cases}\Delta_g u + \alpha u + \beta v = u^{2^\star-1}\\ \Delta_g v + \beta u + \gamma v = v^{2^\star-1}\end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

as soon as α, β, and γ are such that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(h(x)-\alpha(x)\big)\frac{u(x)}{v(x)} &= \big(k(x)-\gamma(x)\big)\frac{v(x)}{u(x)}\\ &= \beta(x)\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for all $x \in M$. In other words, two positive solutions of scalar equations like (0.3) provide several examples (e.g like a one parameter family w.r.t β) of 2-systems with strongly positive solutions. These solutions, see Remark 2.2 in Section 2, are certainly not minimizing if $\beta > 0$.

In what follows we discuss particular examples where we do get solutions with arbitrarily large energies (Proposition 3.1), and multiple solutions with distinct energies (Proposition 3.2). For M a smooth compact Riemannian $(n-1)$-manifold, $n \ge 3$, and S^1 the circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of radius 1 centered at 0, we let $\hat{M} = S^1 \times M$ and $\hat{g}$ be the standard product metric on $\hat{M}$. For $p \ge 1$, and $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, we consider the system

$$\Delta_{\hat{g}} u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{3.3}$$

in $\hat{M}$, for all $i = 1, \dots p$, where (t,x), $t \in S^1$, $x \in M$, is the variable in $\hat{M}$. For $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ a solution of (3.3), we let $E(\mathcal{U})$ be the energy of $\mathcal{U}$ given by $E(\mathcal{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \|u_i\|_{2^\star}^{2^\star}$. We let also $\Lambda_{min} = K_n^{-n}$, where K_n is as in (2.1), and let Id_p be the $p \times p$-identity matrix. If $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ is a minimizer for $\mu_{A,g}^p(M)$, and $\mu_{A,g}^p(M) > 0$, where $\mu_{A,g}^p(M)$ is defined in (2.5), then $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_p)$ is a solution of (3.3) when we let $\tilde{u}_i = \mu_{A,g}^p(M)^{(n-2)/4} u_i$ for all i. Its energy $E(\tilde{\mathcal{U}})$ is such that $E(\tilde{\mathcal{U}}) \le \Lambda_{min}$. We prove here that the following result holds.

Proposition 3.1. *Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian $(n-1)$-manifold, $n \ge 3$. For any $\Lambda > 0$ there exist positive real numbers $K_1(\Lambda) < K_2(\Lambda)$ such that if $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies that*

$$K_1(\Lambda) Id_p < A(x) < K_2(\Lambda) Id_p \tag{3.4}$$

for all x, in the sense of bilinear forms, then (3.3) in $\hat{M} = S^1 \times M$ possesses a solution $\mathcal{U}$ of energy $\Lambda \le E(\mathcal{U}) \le \Lambda + \Lambda_{min}$. The solution can be chosen weakly positive if $-A$ is cooperative, and strongly positive if the system is also fully coupled.

Proof. For $m \ge 1$, we let $S^1(1/m)$ be the circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of radius $1/m$ centered at 0. We let $M_m = S^1(1/m) \times M$ and g_m be the standard product metric on M_m.

We denote by (t,x) the variable in $S^1(1/m) \times M$, and G_m be the subgroup of $O(2)$ generated by $z \to e^{2i\pi/m}z$. We regard G_m as acting on $\hat{M} = S^1 \times M$ by $(t,x) \to (\sigma(t),x)$ for $\sigma \in G_m$. Then $\hat{M}/G_m = M_m$. We define $B_m = B_0(g_m)$ to be the smallest B such that

$$\|u\|_{2^\star}^2 \leq K_n^2 \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + B\|u\|_2^2$$

for all $u \in H_1^2(M_m)$. For $t \in (0,B_m)$, and $t' = K_n^{-2}t$, we let $\lambda_t = \mu^1_{t',g_m}(M_m)$ with the notations in Section 2. It can be proved (see for instance Druet, Hebey and Robert [20]) that B_m exists, that $B_m \geq V_{g_m}^{-2/n}$, where V_{g_m} is the volume of M_m with respect to g_m, that λ_t is nondecreasing in T, and that $\lambda_t \to K_n^{-2}$ as $t \to B_m$. For $\Lambda > 0$ we let $m = m_\Lambda$ be given by $m = [\Lambda_{min}^{-1}\Lambda] + 1$, where, for $X > 0$, $[X]$ is the greatest integer not exceeding X. We let also $T(\Lambda) \in (0,B_m)$ be such that

$$\Lambda < \left([\Lambda_{min}^{-1}\Lambda] + 1\right)\lambda_t^{\frac{n}{2}} \tag{3.5}$$

for all $T(\Lambda) < t < B_m$. Then we define

$$K_1(\Lambda) = K_n^{-2}T(\Lambda) \text{ and } K_2(\Lambda) = K_n^{-2}B_m \ .$$

Let $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ be such that (3.4) holds for all $x \in M$, in the sense of bilinear forms. Since A does not depend on the variable t, we may regard A as defined in M_m. Moreover, since M is compact, there exist $t_{min} < t_{max}$ in $(K_1(\Lambda), K_2(\Lambda))$ such that $t_{min}Id_p \leq A(x) \leq t_{max}Id_p$ for all x, in the sense of bilinear forms. In particular, by (2.6), we can write that

$$\mu^1_{t_{min},g_m}(M_m) \leq \mu^p_{A,g_m}(M_m) \leq \mu^1_{t_{max},g_m}(M_m) \ . \tag{3.6}$$

Since $t_{max} < K_2(\Lambda)$, coming back to the very first definition of B_m, we do get that $\mu^1_{t_{max},g_m}(M_m) < K_n^{-2}$. Then, by Theorem 2.1, there exist $\mathcal{U} = (u_1,\dots,u_p)$ a solution in M_m of the system

$$\Delta_{g_m}u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x)u_j = \mu^p_{A,g_m}(M_m)|u_i|^{2^\star-2}u_i$$

for all i, and such that $\sum_{i=1}^p \|u_i\|_{2^\star}^{2^\star} = 1$. The solution can be chosen weakly positive if $-A$ is cooperative, and strongly positive if the system is also fully coupled. We let $\tilde{u}_i$ be given by

$$\tilde{u}_i = \mu^p_{A,g_m}(M_m)^{\frac{n-2}{4}}u_i$$

and $\hat{u}_i$ be the function in $\hat{M}$ such that $\hat{u}_i/G_m = \tilde{u}_i$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = (\hat{u}_1,\dots,\hat{u}_p)$ is a solution of (3.3), and by (3.5) and (3.6), its energy

$$E(\hat{\mathcal{U}}) = m\mu^p_{A,g_m}(M_m)^{n/2}$$

is such that $\Lambda \leq E(\hat{\mathcal{U}}) \leq \Lambda + \Lambda_{min}$. This proves the proposition. $\square$

Following ideas in Hebey and Vaugon [27] we may also prove existence of several solutions of distinct energies in particular cases. For $T > 0$, and $n \geq 3$, let M_T be the manifold $M_T = S^1(T) \times S^{n-1}$ and g_T be the standard product metric on M_T. For $p \geq 1$, and $A : S^{n-1} \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, we consider the system

$$\Delta_{g_T}u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x)u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2}u_i \tag{3.7}$$

in M_T, for all $i = 1, \dots p$, where (t, x), $t \in S^1(T)$, $x \in S^{n-1}$, is the variable in M_T. We claim that the following multiplicity result holds. Such a result goes back to Schoen [48] (see also Hebey and Vaugon [27]) where it was proved when $p = 1$ for the Yamabe equation.

Proposition 3.2. *For any integer $k \geq 1$, and any $q > n/2$, there exists $T(k, q) > 0$ with the property that if $T \geq T(k, q)$ and $A : S^{n-1} \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ is such that*

$$\left(\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} - \frac{1}{T^q}\right) Id_p \leq A(x) \leq \frac{(n-2)^2}{4} Id_p \tag{3.8}$$

for all x, in the sense of bilinear forms, then (3.7) possesses k solutions of distinct energies in $M_T = S^1(T) \times S^{n-1}$. Moreover, these solutions can be chosen weakly positive if $-A$ is cooperative, and strongly positive if the system is also fully coupled.

Proof. Let $t > 0$. We know from Hebey and Vaugon [27] that

$$\frac{1}{K_n^2} \|u\|_{2^\star}^2 \leq \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} + \frac{1}{4t^2}\right) \|u\|_2^2 \tag{3.9}$$

for all $u \in H_1^2(M_t)$. We fix $k \geq 1$ integer, and let G_α, $\alpha = 1, \dots, k$, be k groups of order α like the G_m's in the proof of Proposition 3.1. We let G_α act on M_T, $T > 0$, by $(t, x) \to (\sigma(t), x)$ for $\sigma \in G_\alpha$. Then $M_T / G_\alpha = M_{T/\alpha}$. Noting that A depends only on the variable in S^{n-1}, we can regard A as defined on all the $M_{T/\alpha}$'s. We assume that A satisfies (3.8) with $T = t$, $t > 0$, and let $\theta_n = (n-2)^2/4$. Then $\theta_n = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{g_t}$ for all $t > 0$, where S_{g_t} is the scalar curvature of g_t, and it follows from the right inequality in (3.8), Theorem 2.1, and the resolution of the Yamabe problem, that there exists a minimizer $\mathcal{U}_t$ for $\mu_{A,g_t}^p(M_t)$. Moreover, still by Theorem 2.1, $\mathcal{U}_t$ can be chosen weakly positive if $-A$ is cooperative, and strongly positive if the system is also fully coupled. For $u \in L^{2^\star}(M_t)$, of norm 1 in $L^{2^\star}(M_t)$, we can write with Hölder's inequality that $\|u\|_2 \leq (2\pi t \omega_{n-1})^{1/n}$, where ω_{n-1} is the volume of the unit $(n-1)$-sphere. By (2.6), (3.8), and (3.9) we then get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(1 - F_q(t)\right) K_n^{-2} \leq \mu_{A,g_t}^p(M_t) \leq K_n^{-2}\ , \text{ where} \\ &F_q(t) = (2\pi\omega_{n-1})^{2/n} K_n^2 \left(\frac{1}{t^q} + \frac{1}{4t^2}\right) t^{2/n}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Given $T > 0$, we let $\mathcal{U}_{T,\alpha}$ be the minimizer $\mathcal{U}_t$ for $t = T/\alpha$. Then we let $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{T,\alpha}$ be the map on M_T such that $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{T,\alpha} / G_\alpha = \mathcal{U}_{T,\alpha}$, and

$$\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha} = \mu_{A,g_{T/\alpha}}^p(M_{T/\alpha})^{\frac{n-2}{4}} \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{T,\alpha}\ .$$

It is easily checked that $\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha}$ is a solution of (3.7) in M_T for all α, and that the energy $E(\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha})$ is such that

$$E(\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha})^{2/n} = \alpha^{2/n} \mu_{A,g_{T/\alpha}}^p(M_{T/\alpha})\ . \tag{3.11}$$

In particular, it follows from (3.10) and (3.11) that $E(\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha-1})^{2/n} < E(\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha})^{2/n}$ for all $\alpha = 2, \dots, k$ if $F_q(T/\alpha) < \left(\alpha^{2/n} - (\alpha-1)^{2/n}\right) \alpha^{-2/n}$ for all $\alpha = 2, \dots, k$. Since $q > 2/n$, such inequalities are satisfied for $T \geq T(k, q)$ sufficiently large, and we get k solutions $\mathcal{W}_{T,\alpha}$ of (3.7) in M_T with distinct energies. This proves the proposition. □

4. THE H_1^2-THEORY FOR BLOW-UP

In what follows we let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$. We let $A(\alpha) = (A_{ij}^\alpha)$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}^\alpha(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{4.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume in what follows that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists $C > 0$, independent of α, and a continuous map $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^\alpha(x) X_i X_j| \leq C \sum_i (X_i)^2 \text{ , and} \\ &A_{ij}^\alpha \to A_{ij} \text{ in } L^2(M) \text{ as } \alpha \to +\infty \text{ ,} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where the first equation in (4.2) should hold for all α, $x \in M$, and $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ in $\mathbb{R}^p$, and the second equation in (4.2) should hold for all i,j. We denote by $I_{\alpha,p}$ the functional defined for $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}) = &\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_i u_j dv_g \\ &- \frac{1}{2^\star}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

We say that a sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ is a *Palais-Smale sequence* for (4.1), or for $I_{\alpha,p}$, if the $I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)$'s are bounded with respect to α, and $DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) \to 0$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)'$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. The Palais-Smale sequence is said to be nonnegative if the components of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ are nonnegative functions. For $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ a converging sequence of points in M, and $(\mu_\alpha)_\alpha$ a sequence of positive real numbers converging to zero, we define a 1-*bubble* as a sequence $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ of functions in M given by

$$B_\alpha(x) = \left(\frac{\mu_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha^2 + \frac{d_g(x_\alpha,x)^2}{n(n-2)}}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \ . \tag{4.4}$$

The x_α's are referred to as the *centers* and the μ_α's as the *weights* of the 1-bubble $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$. We define a *p-bubble* as a sequence $(\mathcal{B}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of p-maps such that, if we write that $\mathcal{B}_\alpha = (B_\alpha^1, \dots, B_\alpha^p)$, then $(B_\alpha^i)_\alpha$ is a 1-bubble for exactly one i, and for $j \neq i$, $(B_\alpha^j)_\alpha$ is the trivial zero sequence. In other words, a p-bubble is a sequence of p-maps such that one of the components of the sequence is a 1-bubble, and the other components are trivial zero sequences. One remark with respect to the definition (4.4) is that if $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$u(x) = \left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{n(n-2)}\right)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \ , \tag{4.5}$$

then u is a positive solution of the critical Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star - 1}$, where $\Delta = -\sum \partial^2/\partial x_i^2$. More precisely, u is the only positive solution of the equation in $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is such that $u(0) = 1$ and u is maximum at 0. All the other positive solutions of the equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star - 1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, see Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [8] and Obata [43], are then given by $\tilde{u}(x) = \lambda^{(n-2)/2} u\left(\lambda(x-a)\right)$, where $\lambda > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Another remark with respect to the definition (4.4) is that the B_α's in (4.4) live on balls centered at x_α and radii of the order of $\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$. Indeed, an equation like $B_\alpha(x) \ge C$ is equivalent to $d_g(x_\alpha, x) \le C'\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$, where $C, C' > 0$, and we can write that for any $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in B_{x_\alpha}(R\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})} B_\alpha(x) &= \left(\frac{n(n-2)}{R^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} + \varepsilon_\alpha \text{ , and} \\ \sup_{M \backslash B_{x_\alpha}(R\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})} B_\alpha(x) &= \left(\frac{n(n-2)}{R^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} + \varepsilon_\alpha \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where the sequence (ε_α) is such that $\varepsilon_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, the B_α's converge to 0 in $M \backslash B_{x_\alpha}(R_\alpha\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})$ if $R_\alpha \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. On the other hand (see, for instance Druet and Hebey [18]), the B_α's in (4.4) consume their H_1^2-norm on balls centered at x_α and radii of the order of μ_α. We sometimes refer to $\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$ as the C^0-range of interaction of $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$, and to μ_α as the H_1^2-range of interaction of $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$.

Since we assumed that (4.2) holds, there is a limit system for (4.1). The limit system writes as

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{4.7}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$, where the A_{ij}'s are as in (4.2). We let $I_{\infty,p}$ be the functional defined for $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\infty,p}(\mathcal{U}) = &\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_M A_{ij} u_i u_j dv_g \\ &- \frac{1}{2^\star}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

We prove in this section that the following result holds. The case $p = 1$ goes back to Struwe [51], with related references by Brézis and Coron [6], Lions [38], Sacks-Uhlenbeck [45], Schoen [48], and Wente [55]. Theorem 4.1 fully answers the question of describing the asymptotic behaviour of Palais-Smale sequences for (4.1) in terms of Sobolev spaces.

Theorem 4.1 (H_1^2-Theory). *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, $p \ge 1$, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$, $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, a sequence of smooth maps satisfying (4.2). Let also $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a nonnegative Palais-Smale sequence for (4.1). Then there exists a nonnegative solution $\mathcal{U}^0$ of the limit system (4.7), there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and there exist p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}^0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha} + \mathcal{R}_\alpha \tag{4.9}$$

for all α, where $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ converging strongly to 0 in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

Let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha^1, \dots, u_\alpha^p)$, $\mathcal{U}^0 = (u_1^0, \dots, u_p^0)$, and $\mathcal{R}_\alpha = (R_\alpha^1, \dots, R_\alpha^p)$. Another way we can write the H_1^2-decomposition (4.9) is that for any i,

$$u_\alpha^i = u_i^0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} B_{j,\alpha}^i + R_\alpha^i \ , \tag{4.10}$$

where the k_i's are nonnegative integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^p k_i = k$, possibly $k_i = 0$ for some $i = 1, \dots, p$, and the $(B_{j,\alpha}^i)_\alpha$'s are the 1-bubbles from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined.

In addition to (4.9), we also have that the energy of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s split. Namely we can write that for any α,

$$I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = I_{\infty,p}(\mathcal{U}^0) + \frac{k}{n} K_n^{-n} + o(1) \ , \tag{4.11}$$

where K_n is as in (2.1), $I_{\alpha,p}$ is as in (4.3), $I_{\infty,p}$ is as in (4.8), and $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Note that for $(\mathcal{B}_\alpha)_\alpha$ a p-bubble, $I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{B}_\alpha) = n^{-1}K_n^{-n} + o(1)$. An independent remark is that if $-A$ is cooperative, then $\mathcal{U}^0$ is weakly positive, and if $-A$ is cooperative and the limit system (4.7) is fully coupled, then either $\mathcal{U}^0$ is zero, or it is strongly positive.

Let $\eta : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $0 \le \eta \le 1$, be a smooth cutoff function such that $\eta = 1$ in $B_0(\delta)$, and $\eta = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \backslash B_0(2\delta)$, for $\delta > 0$ small. In what follows we say that a sequence of functions $(\hat{B}_\alpha)_\alpha$, $\hat{B}_\alpha : M \to \mathbb{R}$, is a generalized 1-bubble if we can write that

$$\hat{B}_\alpha(x) = (R_\alpha)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \eta_\alpha(x) u\left(R_\alpha \exp_{x_\alpha}^{-1}(x)\right) \ , \tag{4.12}$$

where $u \not\equiv 0$ is a solution in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the critical Euclidean equation $\Delta u = |u|^{2^\star - 2}u$, $(R_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a sequence of positive real numbers such that $R_\alpha \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a converging sequence of points in M, and $\eta_\alpha = \eta \circ \exp_{x_\alpha}^{-1}$. The x_α's are referred to as the centers and the R_α's as the weights of $(\hat{B}_\alpha)_\alpha$. If u is positive, see for instance Druet and Hebey [18], generalized 1-bubbles are like 1-bubbles in the sense that for any $(\hat{B}_\alpha)_\alpha$ there exists $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ such that $\hat{B}_\alpha = B_\alpha + R_\alpha$ for all α, where $R_\alpha \to 0$ in $H_1^2(M)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$.

Proof. We prove Theorem 4.1 by coming back to the well understood $p = 1$ case. Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a nonnegative Palais-Smale sequence for (4.1). As above, we write that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha^1, \dots, u_\alpha^p)$. First we claim that

$$\text{the sequence } (\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha \text{ is bounded in } H_{1,p}^2(M) \ . \tag{4.13}$$

In order to prove (4.13), we start noting that the equation

$$\begin{aligned} DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha).\mathcal{U}_\alpha \ &= \ \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g + \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \ , \end{aligned}$$

and the equation $DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha).\mathcal{U}_\alpha = o\left(\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}\right)$, give that

$$I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g + o\left(\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}\right) \ .$$

By the definition of a Palais-Smale sequence, $|I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)| \leq C$, where $C > 0$ is independent of α. Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \leq C + o\left(\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}\right) , \tag{4.14}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α, and by Hölder's inequality, we can also write that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \leq C + o\left(\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}^{2/2^\star}\right) , \tag{4.15}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α. By (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g + \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g \\ &= 2I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) + \frac{2}{2^\star} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \\ &\leq C + o\left(\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}\right) , \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α. By (4.2) we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{H_{1,p}^2}^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g + \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g + \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g + C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \end{aligned}$$

and we easily get that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s are bounded in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ by combining the above equation with (4.15) and (4.16). This proves (4.13). Now we let I_p be the decoupled functional defined for $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \ldots, u_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ by

$$I_p(\mathcal{U}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |\nabla u_i|^2 dv_g - \frac{1}{2^\star} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |u_i|^{2^\star} dv_g . \tag{4.17}$$

By (4.13), up to passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \rightharpoonup \mathcal{U}^0$ weakly in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$, that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \to \mathcal{U}^0$ strongly in $L_p^2(M)$, and that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \to \mathcal{U}^0$ almost everywhere, where $\mathcal{U}^0 = (u_1^0, \ldots, u_p^0)$ is some map in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$, the convergences have to be understood as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and the convergence in $L_p^2(M)$ means that $u_\alpha^i \to u_i^0$ in $L^2(M)$ for all i. In particular, $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a nonnegative p-map. We let $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}_\alpha - \mathcal{U}^0$, and $\hat{u}_\alpha^i = u_\alpha^i - u_i^0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Now we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{U}^0 \text{ is a nonnegative solution of the limit system (4.7)} , \\ &(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha)_\alpha \text{ is a Palais-Smale sequence for } I_p \text{ , and} \\ &I_p(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha) = I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) - I_{\infty,p}(\mathcal{U}^0) + o(1) \text{ for all } \alpha , \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In order to prove (4.18), we first observe that if $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha).\Phi &= \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (\nabla u_\alpha^i \nabla \varphi_i) dv_g + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i \varphi_j dv_g \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star - 1} \varphi_i dv_g \\ &= o(1) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By (4.2), $A_{ij}^\alpha \to A_{ij}$ in $L^q(M)$ for all $q \geq 1$ and all i, j, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, by Hölder's inequality, and (4.13), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \left| A_{ij}^\alpha - A_{ij} \right| u_\alpha^i |\varphi_j| dv_g &\leq \| u_\alpha^i \|_{2^\star} \left\| A_{ij}^\alpha - A_{ij} \right\|_n \| \varphi_j \|_2 \\ &= o(1) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Combining (4.19) and (4.20), passing to the limit as $\alpha \to +\infty$, it easily follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (\nabla u_i^0 \nabla \varphi_i) dv_g + \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij} u_i^0 \varphi_j dv_g = \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_i^0)^{2^\star - 1} \varphi_i dv_g \ .$$

Since Φ is arbitrary, this proves that $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a nonnegative solution of the limit system (4.7). Now we compute the energy of $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha$. We write that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g - \int_M A_{ij} u_i^0 u_j^0 dv_g \\ &= \int_M \left(A_{ij}^\alpha - A_{ij} \right) u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g + \int_M A_{ij} (u_\alpha^i - u_i^0) u_\alpha^j dv_g \\ &\quad + \int_M A_{ij} u_i^0 (u_\alpha^j - u_j^0) dv_g \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

for all α, and all i, j. By (4.2), as already mentionned, $A_{ij}^\alpha \to A_{ij}$ in $L^q(M)$ for all $q \geq 1$ and all i, j. In particular, $A_{ij}^\alpha \to A_{ij}$ in $L^{n/2}(M)$, and by (4.2) and (4.13), we get with (4.21) that

$$\sum_{ij=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g = \sum_{ij=1}^p \int_M A_{ij} u_i^0 u_j^0 dv_g + o(1) \ , \tag{4.22}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Since $u_\alpha^i \rightharpoonup u_i^0$ in H_1^2,

$$\int_M |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g = \int_M |\nabla u_i^0|^2 dv_g + \int_M |\nabla \hat{u}_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g + o(1) \tag{4.23}$$

for all α and i. By (4.22) and (4.23), we then get that

$$I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = I_{\infty,p}(\mathcal{U}^0) + I_p(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha) - \frac{1}{2^\star} \int_M \mathcal{K}_\alpha dv_g + o(1) \tag{4.24}$$

for all α, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^p \left(|\hat{u}_\alpha^i + u_i^0|^{2^\star} - |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star} - |u_i^0|^{2^\star} \right) \ .$$

Noting that there exists $C > 0$, independent of α, such that

$$\int_M |\mathcal{K}_\alpha| dv_g \le C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M \left(|\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 1} |u_i^0| dv_g + |u_i^0|^{2^\star - 1} |\hat{u}_\alpha^i| \right) dv_g$$

for all α, and that, by basic integration theory,

$$\int_M |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 1} |u_i^0| dv_g = o(1) \text{ and } \int_M |u_i^0|^{2^\star - 1} |\hat{u}_\alpha^i| dv_g = o(1)$$

for all α and i, we get with (4.24) that

$$I_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = I_{\infty,p}(\mathcal{U}^0) + I_p(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha) + o(1)$$

for all α, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. This proves the third assertion in (4.18). It remains to prove the second assertion, namely that $(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_p. Let $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)$ be given in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$. With similar arguments to those used above, and thanks to the Sobolev inequality, we can write that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^i \varphi_j dv_g = \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij} u_i^0 \varphi_j + o\left(\|\Phi\|_{H_{1,p}^2} \right)$$

for all α. In particular, since $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a solution of the limit system (4.7), we can write that

$$DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha).\Phi = DI_p(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha).\Phi - \int_M \mathcal{K}_\alpha^\Phi dv_g + o\left(\|\Phi\|_{H_{1,p}^2} \right) \tag{4.25}$$

for all α, where

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha^\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^p \left(|\hat{u}_\alpha^i + u_i^0|^{2^\star - 2} (\hat{u}_\alpha^i + u_i^0) - |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 2} \hat{u}_\alpha^i - |u_i^0|^{2^\star - 2} u_i^0 \right) \varphi_i \ .$$

Noting that there exists $C > 0$, independent of α, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M |\mathcal{K}_\alpha^\Phi| dv_g &\le C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M \left(|\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 2} |u_i^0| |\varphi_i| + |u_i^0|^{2^\star - 2} |\hat{u}_\alpha^i| |\varphi_i| \right) dv_g \\ &\le C \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\left\| |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i^0 \right\|_{2^\star/(2^\star - 1)} + \left\| |\hat{u}_i^0|^{2^\star - 2} u_\alpha^i \right\|_{2^\star/(2^\star - 1)} \right) \|\varphi_i\|_{2^\star} \end{aligned}$$

for all α, and that, by basic integration theory,

$$\left\| |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i^0 \right\|_{2^\star/(2^\star - 1)} = o(1) \text{ and } \left\| |\hat{u}_i^0|^{2^\star - 2} u_\alpha^i \right\|_{2^\star/(2^\star - 1)} = o(1)$$

for all α and i, we get with (4.25) and the Sobolev inequality that

$$DI_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha).\Phi = DI_p(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha).\Phi + o\left(\|\Phi\|_{H_{1,p}^2} \right) \ .$$

Since $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for $I_{\alpha,p}$, we get that $(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_p. This proves (4.18). For $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ and $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)$, we clearly have that $DI_p(\mathcal{U}).\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^p DI_1(u_i).\varphi_i$. Then an easy remark is that $(\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_p if and only if for any i, the sequence $(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for I_1. We may therefore apply the result in the $p = 1$ case to the $(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)_\alpha$'s (see, for instance, Druet, Hebey and Robert [20] or Druet and Hebey [18] for a presentation of the $p = 1$ case in the Riemannian setting). In particular, we get from this result in the $p = 1$ case that for any i, there exists k_i

integer, and generalized 1-bubbles $(\hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ as in (4.12), $j=1,\dots,k_i$, such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\hat{u}^i_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha} + R_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad I_1(\hat{u}^i_\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} E_f(u^i_j) + o(1)\ , \tag{4.26}$$

where $o(1)\to 0$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$, u^i_j is the nontrivial solution of $\Delta u = |u|^{2^\star-2}u$ from which the generalized 1-bubble $(\hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ is defined, namely

$$\hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha}(x) = \left(R^i_{j,\alpha}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \eta^i_{j,\alpha}(x) u^i_j\left(R^i_{j,\alpha}\exp^{-1}_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(x)\right)$$

with notations like in (4.12), and $E_f(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\nabla u|^2dx - \frac{1}{2^\star}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|u|^{2^\star}dx$. We define $\tilde{u}^i_{j,\alpha} : B_0\left(\delta\mu^i_{j,\alpha}\right)\to\mathbb{R}$, $\delta>0$ small, by

$$\tilde{u}^i_{j,\alpha}(x) = (\mu^i_{j,\alpha})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\hat{u}^i_\alpha\left(\exp_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}\left(\mu^i_{j,\alpha}x\right)\right)\ ,$$

where $\mu^i_{j,\alpha} = (R^i_{j,\alpha})^{-1}$. Then, see, for instance, Druet, Hebey and Robert [20], we also have that, up to a subsequence, $\tilde{u}^i_{j,\alpha}\to u^i_j$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$. This holds for all $i=1,\dots,p$, and all $j=1,\dots,k_i$. Let $\tilde{v}^i_\alpha : B_0\left(\delta\mu^i_{j,\alpha}\right)\to\mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\tilde{v}^i_{j,\alpha}(x) = (\mu^i_{j,\alpha})^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^0_i\left(\exp_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}\left(\mu^i_{j,\alpha}x\right)\right)\ .$$

Noting that $\tilde{v}^i_{j,\alpha}\to 0$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$, and since $u^i_\alpha\geq 0$ for all i and all α, it follows that $u^i_j\geq 0$ for all $i=1,\dots,p$, and all $j=1,\dots,k_i$. By the maximum principle for scalar equations, we then get that $u^i_j>0$ for all $i=1,\dots,p$, and all $j=1,\dots,k_i$. As already mentioned, this is a situation where generalized 1-bubbles are like 1-bubbles. In particular, for any $i=1,\dots,p$, and any $j=1,\dots,k_i$, there exists a one bubble $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ such that $\hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha} = B^i_{j,\alpha} + R^i_{j,\alpha}$ for all α, where $R^i_{j,\alpha}\to 0$ in $H^2_1(M)$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$. In other words, we may replace in (4.26) the generalized 1-bubbles $(\hat{B}^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ by 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$, and letting $k=\sum_{i=1}^p k_i$, we get that (4.9) follows from (4.26). By noting that $E_f(u) = K_n^{-n}/n$ when u is a positive solution of $\Delta u = |u|^{2^\star-2}u$, where K_n is as in (2.1), we also get (4.11) with (4.18) and (4.26). This ends the proof of the theorem and of the remark after the theorem concerning the splitting of the energy. □

The weak limit $\mathcal{U}^0$ and k are clearly invariants of the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1. Let k_i be the number of p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s which are such that the i^{th}-component of $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ is a 1-bubble. As we easily get from the proof of Theorem 4.1, $k=\sum_{i=1}^p k_i$ and the k_i's are also invariants of the decomposition (4.9). Uniqueness conditions for decompositions like (4.9) are known in the $p=1$ case. They can be found, for instance, in Druet and Hebey [18]. Thanks to these conditions, an additional result we easily get from the above proof is that if we write two decompositions (4.9) with respect to two families $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ of p-bubbles, then, up to renumbering, for any $i=1,\dots,p$, and any $j=1,\dots,k_i$,

$$\frac{\mu^i_{j,\alpha}}{\tilde{\mu}^i_{j,\alpha}}\to 1 \quad\text{and}\quad \frac{d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha},\tilde{x}^i_{j,\alpha})}{\mu^i_{j,\alpha}}\to 0$$

as $\alpha\to+\infty$, where the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s and $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$'s (resp. the $\tilde{x}^i_{j,\alpha}$'s and $\tilde{\mu}^i_{j,\alpha}$'s) are the centers and weights of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ (resp. $(\tilde{B}^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$) from which the $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s (resp. $(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s) are defined. We also get from the proof of Theorem 4.1, and structure conditions we know to hold in the $p = 1$ case, that for any $i = 1, \dots, p$, and any $j_1, j_2 = 1, \dots, k_i$, the structure equations

$$\frac{\mu^i_{j_1,\alpha}}{\mu^i_{j_2,\alpha}} + \frac{\mu^i_{j_2,\alpha}}{\mu^i_{j_1,\alpha}} + \frac{d_g(x^i_{j_1,\alpha}, x^i_{j_2,\alpha})}{\mu^i_{j_1,\alpha}\mu^i_{j_2,\alpha}} \to +\infty$$

hold as $\alpha \to +\infty$ when $j_1 \neq j_2$. An independent result we get from the proof of the theorem is that, up to replacing p-bubbles by generalized p-bubbles, Theorem 4.1 still holds if we do not assume that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s are nonnegative, where, following the definition of a p-bubble, we define a generalized p-bubble as a sequence of p-maps such that one of the components of the sequence is a generalized 1-bubble, and the other components are zero.

An easy consequence of Theorem 4.1 is the $L^{2^\star}$-theory for blow-up (Corollary 4.1 below) where the blow-up phenomenon is described as a sum of Dirac masses in the $L^{2^\star}$-Lebesgue's space. The Dirac masses in Corollary 4.1 are the limits of the $(B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star}$'s as $\alpha \to +\infty$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, $j = 1, \dots, k_i$, where the $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s are the 1-bubbles in the H^2_1-decomposition (4.10) following Theorem 4.1. More direct proofs of Corollary 4.1 can be given.

Corollary 4.1. *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (4.2). Let also $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a nonnegative Palais-Smale sequence for (4.1). For any $i = 1, \dots, p$, up to a subsequence,*

$$(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} \rightharpoonup (u^0_i)^{2^\star} + \sum_{j=1}^{k'_i} \lambda^i_j \delta_{x^i_j} \tag{4.27}$$

weakly in the sense of measures as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\mathcal{U}^0 = (u^0_1, \dots, u^0_p)$ is a nonnegative solution of the limit system (4.7), k'_i is an integer, the x^i_j's are points in M, and the λ^i_j's are positive real numbers, $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, up to a subsequence, we may assume that (4.9) and (4.10) hold for the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. For $i = 1, \dots, p$, we let S_i be the set consisting of the limits as $\alpha \to +\infty$ of the centers $x^i_{j,\alpha}$ of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10). Then we let k'_i be the number of points in S_i, and let the x^i_j's, $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$, be the points in S_i. We have that $k'_i \leq k_i$, and it might be that $k'_i < k_i$ since distinct sequences may have the same limits. It might also be that $k'_i = 0$, and hence that $S_i = \emptyset$ for some i. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be such that $2\delta_0$ is less than any distance between two distinct points in S_i (when $k'_i \geq 2$). Since Palais-Smale sequences are bounded in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$, see (4.13) in the proof of Theorem 4.1, and by the Sobolev embedding theorem, the u^i_α's are bounded in $L^{2^\star}(M)$. In particular, up to a subsequence, we may assume that for any i, and any $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$, there exists λ^i_j such that

$$\lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} (u^0_i)^{2^\star} dv_g + \lambda^i_j \; . \tag{4.28}$$

We fix i and j, and let $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ be a 1-bubble in (4.10) such that its centers $x^i_{j,\alpha}$ converge to x^i_j as $\alpha \to +\infty$. With the notations in (4.10), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} dv_g &= \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} \left(u^0_i + \sum_{m=1}^{k_i} B^i_{m,\alpha}\right)^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1)\\ &\geq \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} (u^0_i)^{2^\star} dv_g + \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0)} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1)\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Combining (4.28) and (4.29), noting that the $L^{2^\star}$-integral of the 1-bubble $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in the right hand side of (4.29) goes to K_n^{-n} as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where K_n is as in (2.1), it follows that $\lambda^i_j > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, p$ and all $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$. Let $\mathcal{B}_i(\delta)$ be the union from $j = 1$ to k'_i of the geodesic balls $B_{x^i_j}(\delta)$, $0 < \delta < \delta_0$. By (4.10), $u^i_\alpha \to u^0_i$ in $L^{2^\star}(M \backslash \mathcal{B}_i(\delta))$ for all $\delta > 0$. In particular, for any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, any $i = 1, \dots, p$, and any $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$,

$$\int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0) \backslash B_{x^i_j}(\delta)} (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta_0) \backslash B_{x^i_j}(\delta)} (u^0_i)^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1) \ , \tag{4.30}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Let $f \in C^0(M)$ and $i = 1, \dots, p$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let also $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ be such that $|f(x) - f(x^i_j)| < \varepsilon$ if $d_g(x^i_j, x) < \delta$, $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$. We can write that

$$\int_M f\left((u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} - (u^0_i)^{2^\star}\right) dv_g = \sum_{j=1}^{k'_i} \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta)} f\left((u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} - (u^0_i)^{2^\star}\right) dv_g + o(1) \ , \tag{4.31}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and, by (4.28) and (4.30), we can also write that

$$\lambda^i_j f(x^i_j) - C\varepsilon \leq \int_{B_{x^i_j}(\delta)} f\left((u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star} - (u^0_i)^{2^\star}\right) dv_g \leq \lambda^i_j f(x^i_j) + C\varepsilon \tag{4.32}$$

for all α and all $j = 1, \dots, k'_i$, where $C > 0$ does not depend on α, ε, i, and j. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, and $f \in C^0(M)$ is arbitrary, we get with (4.31) and (4.32) that (4.27) is true. This proves Corollary 4.1. $\square$

5. Pointwise estimates

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$. We let $A(\alpha) = (A^\alpha_{ij})$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A^\alpha_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{5.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume in this section that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists a $C^{0,\theta}$-map $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, such that

$$A^\alpha_{ij} \to A_{ij} \text{ in } C^{0,\theta}(M) \tag{5.2}$$

for all i, j as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, (4.2) is satisfied. A sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is said to be a sequence of nonnegative solutions of (5.1) if, for any α, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ is a nonnegative solution of (5.1). Clearly the sequence is a Palais-Smale sequence for (5.1) when (and, actually, if and only if) it is also bounded in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$. We prove in this section that passing from Palais-Smale sequences to sequences of solutions we can add pointwise estimates to the description in Theorem 4.1. The main result of this section is as follows.

Theorem 5.1 (Pointwise Estimates)**.** *Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha): M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (5.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (5.1). In addition to the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1, there exists $C > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\left(\min_{i,j} d_g(x_{j,\alpha}^i, x)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \left(u_\alpha^i(x) - u_i^0(x)\right)^2} \leq C \tag{5.3}$$

for all α and all $x \in M$, where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is as in (4.9), $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha^1, \dots, u_\alpha^p)$ for all α, the u_i^0's are the components of $\mathcal{U}^0$, and the $x_{j,\alpha}^i$'s are the centers of the 1-bubbles $(B_{j,\alpha}^i)_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined.

Proof. Let Φ_α be the function such that $\Phi_\alpha(x)$ is the minimum over i,j of the $d_g(x_{j,\alpha}^i, x)$'s, where $x \in M$, and let Ψ_α be the function

$$\Psi_\alpha(x) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p u_\alpha^i(x)^2 \Phi_\alpha(x)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}\ . \tag{5.4}$$

In order to prove (5.3), it suffices to prove that $(\Psi_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in $L^\infty(M)$. We proceed by contradiction. We let the y_α's be points in M such that the Ψ_α's are maximum at y_α and $\Psi_\alpha(y_\alpha) \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_\alpha^{i_0}(y_\alpha) \geq u_\alpha^i(y_\alpha)$ for some $i_0 = 1, \dots, p$, and all i. We set $\mu_\alpha = u_\alpha^{i_0}(y_\alpha)^{-2/(n-2)}$. Then $\mu_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and by (5.4) we also have that

$$\frac{d_g(x_{j,\alpha}^i, y_\alpha)}{\mu_\alpha} \to +\infty \tag{5.5}$$

for all i,j, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Let $\delta > 0$ be less than the injectivity radius of (M,g). For $i = 1, \dots, p$, we define the function v_α^i in $B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1})$ by

$$v_\alpha^i(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha^i\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)\ , \tag{5.6}$$

where $B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1})$ is the Euclidean ball of radius $\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1}$ centered at 0, and $\exp_{y_\alpha}$ is the exponential map at y_α. Given $R > 0$ and $x \in B_0(R)$, the Euclidean ball of radius R centered at 0, we can write with (5.4) and (5.6) that

$$v_\alpha^i(x) \leq \frac{\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \Psi_\alpha\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)}{\Phi_\alpha\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \tag{5.7}$$

for all i, when α is sufficiently large. For any i,j, and $x \in B_0(R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_g\left(x_{j,\alpha}^i, \exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) &\geq d_g\left(x_{j,\alpha}^i, y_\alpha\right) - R\mu_\alpha \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{R\mu_\alpha}{\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha)}\right)\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

when α is sufficiently large so that, by (5.5), the right hand side of the last equation is positive. Coming back to (5.7), thanks to the definition of the y_α's, we then get that for any i, and any $x \in B_0(R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_\alpha^i(x) &\le \frac{\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\Psi_\alpha(y_\alpha)}{\Phi_\alpha\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} \\ &\le \sqrt{p}\left(1-\frac{R\mu_\alpha}{\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha)}\right)^{-\frac{n-2}{2}} \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

when α is sufficiently large. In particular, by (5.5) and (5.8), up to passing to a subsequence, the v_α^i's are uniformly bounded in any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for all i. Let $\mathcal{V}_\alpha = (v_\alpha^1, \dots, v_\alpha^p)$. The $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$'s are solutions of the system

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha} v_\alpha^i + \sum_{j=1}^p \mu_\alpha^2 \tilde{A}_{ij}^\alpha v_\alpha^j = (v_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} , \tag{5.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{A}_{ij}^\alpha(x) = A_{ij}^\alpha\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \text{ , and} \\ &g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp_{y_\alpha}^\star g\right)(\mu_\alpha x) . \end{aligned}$$

Let ξ be the Euclidean metric. Clearly, for any compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, by standard elliptic theory, we get that the v_α^i's are uniformly bounded in $C_{loc}^{2,\theta}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all i, where $0 < \theta < 1$. In particular, up to a subsequence, we can assume that $v_\alpha^i \to v_i$ in $C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for all i, where the v_i's are nonnegative functions in $C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The v_i's are bounded in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by (5.8), and such that $v_{i_0}(0) = 1$ by construction. Without loss of generality, we may also assume that the v_i's are in $\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and in $L^{2^\star}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all i, where $\mathcal{D}_1^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Beppo-Levi space defined as the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the space of smooth function with compact support in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with respect to the norm $\|u\| = \|\nabla u\|_2$. We let $\mathcal{V} = (v_1, \dots, v_p)$. According to the above, $\mathcal{V} \not\equiv 0$ is nonnegative and nonzero. For any i, and any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{B_0(R)} (v_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} .$$

It follows that for any i, and any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v_i)^{2^\star} dx + \varepsilon_R(\alpha) , \tag{5.10}$$

where $\varepsilon_R(\alpha)$ is such that $\lim_R \lim_\alpha \varepsilon_R(\alpha) = 0$, and the limits are as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and $R \to +\infty$. Thanks to the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1, see also (4.10), we can write that for any i, and any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} \left(u_i^0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} B_{j,\alpha}^i + R_\alpha^i\right)^{2^\star} dv_g ,$$

where $R_\alpha^i \to 0$ in $H_1^2(M)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In particular, we get that for any i, and any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \le C \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1) , \tag{5.11}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and $C > 0$ is independent of α, i, and R. Now we claim that, thanks to (5.5),

$$\lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g = 0 \tag{5.12}$$

for all $R > 0$ and all i, j. In order to prove (5.12), we distinguish two cases. In what follows we fix $R > 0$, i, and j, and let the $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$'s be the weights of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$. In the first case we assume that for any $R' > 0$, up to a subsequence,

$$B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha) \bigcap B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R'\mu^i_{j,\alpha}) = \emptyset$$

for all α. Then,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g \le \int_{M \backslash B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R'\mu^i_{j,\alpha})} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g \ .$$

Noting that

$$\int_{M \backslash B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R'\mu^i_{j,\alpha})} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g = \varepsilon_{R'}(\alpha) \ ,$$

where $\lim_{R'} \lim_\alpha \varepsilon_{R'}(\alpha) = 0$, and the limits are as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and $R' \to +\infty$, we get that (5.12) is true in this case. In the second case we assume that there exists $R' > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha) \bigcap B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R'\mu^i_{j,\alpha}) \neq \emptyset$$

for all α. Then

$$d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, y_\alpha) \le R\mu_\alpha + R'\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$$

and it follows from (5.5) that $\mu_\alpha = o(\mu^i_{j,\alpha})$ and $d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, y_\alpha) = O(\mu^i_{j,\alpha})$. Writing that

$$B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha) \subset \exp_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}\left(\mu^i_{j,\alpha} B_{z_\alpha}(C\Lambda_\alpha)\right) \ ,$$

where $z_\alpha = \frac{1}{\mu^i_{j,\alpha}} \exp^{-1}_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(y_\alpha)$ converges in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (up to a subsequence), $C > 1$ is independent of α and R, and $\Lambda_\alpha = R\mu_\alpha/\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$, we then get that

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(R\mu_\alpha)} (B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g \le \int_{B_{z_\alpha}(C\Lambda_\alpha)} u^{2^\star} dv_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} \ ,$$

where u is given by (4.5), and $\tilde{g}_\alpha$ is the metric given by $\tilde{g}_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp^\star_{x^i_{j,\alpha}} g\right)(\mu^i_{j,\alpha} x)$. Since $\mu_\alpha = o(\mu^i_{j,\alpha})$, we have that

$$\int_{B_{z_\alpha}(C\Lambda_\alpha)} u^{2^\star} dv_{\tilde{g}_\alpha} = o(1)$$

and this proves (5.12) in this case. In particular, (5.12) is true, and coming back to (5.10) and (5.11), we get that, for any i, and any $R > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v_i)^{2^\star} dx = \varepsilon_R(\alpha) \ , \tag{5.13}$$

where $\varepsilon_R(\alpha)$ is such that $\lim_R \lim_\alpha \varepsilon_R(\alpha) = 0$, and the limits are as $\alpha \to +\infty$ and $R \to +\infty$. Letting $\alpha \to +\infty$, and then $R \to +\infty$, this implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (v_i)^{2^\star} dx = 0$ for all i. Since $\mathcal{V} \not\equiv 0$, we get the desired contradiction. The theorem is proved. $\square$

Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (5.1). Up to passing to a subsequence, the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1, and the estimate (5.3) of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied by the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. We let $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$ be the set consisting of the limits of the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s, where the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s, are the centers of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined. Let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$. Easy consequences of Theorem 5.1 are that $\mathcal{S}_{geom} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if the sequences $(u^i_\alpha)_\alpha$ are not all bounded in $L^\infty(M)$, but also that the sequences $(u^i_\alpha)_\alpha$ are all bounded in $L^\infty_{loc}(M \backslash \mathcal{S}_{geom})$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. From (5.1), and by standard elliptic theory, it easily follows that

$$u^i_\alpha \to u^0_i \text{ in } C^2_{loc}(M \backslash \mathcal{S}_{geom}) \tag{5.14}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all i, where the u^0_i's are, as in (5.3), the components of $\mathcal{U}^0$ in (4.9). The points in $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$ are referred to as the *geometrical blow-up points* of the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$. Needless to say, since different sequences may have the same limits, $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$ may consist of any number $m \le k$ of points, where k is the number of p-bubbles involved in (4.9). We say that the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ *blows up* when $\mathcal{S}_{geom} \neq \emptyset$.

An important complement to Theorem 5.1 is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, $p \ge 1$, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (5.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (5.1). In addition to the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1, and to the estimate (5.3) in Theorem 5.1, there also holds that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty} \lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \left[\sup_{x \in M\backslash\Omega_\alpha(R)} \left(\min_{i,j} d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, x)\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^p \left(u^i_\alpha(x) - u^0_i(x)\right)^2} \right] = 0 ,$$

where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is as in (4.9), $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$ for all α, the u^0_i's are the components of $\mathcal{U}^0$, the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s and $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$'s are the centers and weights of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined, and where $\Omega_\alpha(R)$ for $R > 0$ is given by $\Omega_\alpha(R) = \bigcup_{i,j} B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R\mu^i_{j,\alpha})$.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we let Φ_α be the function such that $\Phi_\alpha(x)$ is the minimum over i, j of the $d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, x)$'s, where $x \in M$. We proceed by contradiction and assume that there exists a sequence $(y_\alpha)_\alpha$ of points in M, and that there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for any i, j,

$$\frac{d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, y_\alpha)}{\mu^i_{j,\alpha}} \to +\infty \tag{5.15}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and such that

$$\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^p \left|u^i_\alpha(y_\alpha) - u^0_i(y_\alpha)\right| \ge \delta_0 \tag{5.16}$$

for all α. By (5.14), $\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ since, if not, $u^i_\alpha(y_\alpha) - u^0_i(y_\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for all i. Up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u^{i_0}_\alpha(y_\alpha) \ge u^i_\alpha(y_\alpha)$ for some $i_0 = 1, \dots, p$, and all i. We set $\mu_\alpha = u^{i_0}_\alpha(y_\alpha)^{-2/(n-2)}$. Since $\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha)u^0_i(y_\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for all i, up to passing to another subsequence, we get with (5.16) that

$$\frac{\Phi_\alpha(y_\alpha)}{\mu_\alpha} \ge \delta_1 \tag{5.17}$$

for all α, and some $\delta_1 > 0$. In particular, $\mu_\alpha \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Let $\delta > 0$ be less than the injectivity radius of (M,g). For $i = 1, \dots, p$, we define the function v_α^i in $B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1})$ by

$$v_\alpha^i(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u_\alpha^i\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) , \tag{5.18}$$

where $B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1})$ is the Euclidean ball of radius $\delta\mu_\alpha^{-1}$ centered at 0, and $\exp_{y_\alpha}$ is the exponential map at y_α. By (5.17) we can write that for any sequence $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ of points in $B_0(\delta_1/2)$, and for any i, j,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d_g\left(x_{j,\alpha}^i, \exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x_\alpha)\right) & \ge & d_g\left(x_{j,\alpha}^i, y_\alpha\right) - d_g\left(y_\alpha, \exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x_\alpha)\right) \\ & \ge & \delta_1\mu_\alpha - |x_\alpha|\mu_\alpha \\ & \ge & C\mu_\alpha \end{array}$$

for all α, where $C > 0$ is independent of α. With the estimate (5.3) of Theorem 5.1, we then get that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$v_\alpha^i(x) \le C \tag{5.19}$$

for all $x \in B_0(\delta_1/2)$, all i, and all α. In particular, we may now follow the arguments developed in the proof of Theorem 5.1. We let $\mathcal{V}_\alpha = (v_\alpha^1, \dots, v_\alpha^p)$. Then the $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$'s are solutions of the system

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha} v_\alpha^i + \sum_{j=1}^p \mu_\alpha^2 \tilde{A}_{ij}^\alpha v_\alpha^j = (v_\alpha^i)^{2^\star - 1} , \tag{5.20}$$

where $\tilde{A}_{ij}^\alpha(x) = A_{ij}^\alpha\left(\exp_{y_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right)$, and $g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp_{y_\alpha}^\star g\right)(\mu_\alpha x)$. Let ξ be the Euclidean metric. Clearly, for any compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By standard elliptic theory, (5.19), and (5.20), we then get that the v_α^i's are uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\theta}\left(B_0(\delta_1/4)\right)$ for all i, where $0 < \theta < 1$. In particular, up to another subsequence, we can assume that the v_α^i's converge in $C^2\left(B_0(\delta_1/8)\right)$ for all i. If v_i is the limit of the v_α^i's, it follows from the definition of μ_α that $v_{i_0}(0) = 1$. Let $\delta_2 = \delta_1/8$. For any i,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g &= \int_{B_0(\delta_2)} (v_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} \\ &= \int_{B_0(\delta_2)} (v_i)^{2^\star} dx + o(1) , \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Thanks to the decomposition (4.9) in Theorem 4.1, see also (4.10), we can write that for any i,

$$\int_{B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \le C \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1) , \tag{5.22}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1, see (5.12), we can also write that

$$\lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \int_{B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star} dv_g = 0 \tag{5.23}$$

for all i, j. We prove (5.23) as we prove (5.12) by considering the two cases where $B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha) \cap B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R\mu^i_{j,\alpha}) = \emptyset$ for all $R > 0$, and $B_{y_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha) \cap B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R\mu^i_{j,\alpha}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $R > 0$. In the second case we recover (5.5) thanks to (5.15) by noting that (5.17) and the nonempty intersection give that $\delta_1\mu_\alpha \le \delta_2\mu_\alpha + R\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$ so that $\mu_\alpha \le C\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$. Then, combining (5.21)–(5.23), we get that

$$\int_{B_0(\delta_2)} (v_i)^{2^\star} dx = 0$$

for all i, and taking $i = i_0$, we get a contradiction with the equation $v_{i_0}(0) = 1$. Lemma 5.1 is proved. $\square$

6. L^2-CONCENTRATION

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, $p \ge 1$ integer, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$. We let also $A(\alpha) = (A^\alpha_{ij})$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A^\alpha_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{6.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume in this section that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists a $C^{0,\theta}$-map $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta^p_g + A \text{ is coercive, and} \\ &A^\alpha_{ij} \to A_{ij} \text{ in } C^{0,\theta}(M) \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the second equation in (6.2) should hold for all i, j. The goal in what follows is to prove L^2-concentration (Theorem 6.1 below) for sequences $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of nonnegative solutions of (6.1).

A remark concerning the coercivity assumption in (6.2) is that when $-A$ is cooperative, the existence of strongly positive solutions to systems like (0.1) implies the coercivity of the operator $\Delta^p_g + A$ in (0.1). For such systems, like when $p = 1$, coercivity follows from the existence of positive solutions. Let $\lambda_A(g)$ be, as in Section 2, the infimum of the functional I_A in (2.4) over the $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ which are such that $\sum_i \int_M u_i^2 dv_g = 1$. By compactness of the embedding of H^2_1 in L^2, we easily get that there exists a minimizer $\mathcal{U}_A \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$ for $\lambda_A(g)$. If $-A$ is cooperative, then $\mathcal{U}_A$ can be chosen weakly positive. We let $\mathcal{U}_A = (u^A_1, \dots, u^A_p)$, and let also $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$ be a solution of (0.1). Since $(\Delta^p_g + A)\mathcal{U}_A = \lambda_A(g)\mathcal{U}_A$, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_M u^A_i u_i^{2^\star-1} dv_g &= \sum_i \int_M u^A_i \left(\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij} u_j \right) dv_g \\ &= \sum_i \int_M u_i \left(\Delta_g u^A_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij} u^A_j \right) dv_g \\ &= \lambda_A(g) \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_M u_i u^A_i dv_g \ . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we get that if $-A$ is cooperative and $\mathcal{U}$ is a strongly positive solution of (0.1), then $\lambda_A(g) > 0$ and (see Section 2) $\Delta_g^p + A$ is coercive. This proves the above claim that when $-A$ is cooperative, the existence of a strongly positive solution to a system like (0.1) implies that the operator $\Delta_g^p + A$ in the left hand side of (0.1) is coercive. In general, when no assumption is made on A, and contrary to the scalar case $p = 1$, the existence of a strongly positive solution to a system like (0.1) when $p \geq 2$ does not imply the coercivity of $\Delta_g^p + A$. For instance, with the examples (3.1)–(3.2) of Section 3, one easily constructs 2-systems like (0.1) with strongly positive solutions and such that $A_{12} \gg A_{11} + A_{22}$, and $A_{11}, A_{22} > 0$. In particular, the operator $\Delta_g^2 + A$ is not coercive.

Before we discuss L^2-concentration, we need to prove a De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme for our systems. Let $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, be a continuous map. Let also $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \ldots, u_p)$ be a nonnegative p-map in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$. We say that $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies that

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x) u_j \leq u_i^{2^\star - 1} \tag{6.3}$$

in the sense of distributions, for all $i = 1, \ldots p$, if for any $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p)$ in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$, Φ nonnegative, and any i, we can write that

$$\int_M (\nabla u_i \nabla \varphi_i)\, dv_g + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_M A_{ij} u_i \varphi_j dv_g \leq \int_M (u_i)^{2^\star - 1} \varphi_i dv_g \ ,$$

where $(\nabla u_i \nabla \varphi_i)$ is the pointwise scalar product of ∇u_i and $\nabla \varphi_i$. In what follows, for $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \ldots, u_p)$, and $q > 0$, we let $|\mathcal{U}|^q = \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i|^q$. In particular, when $q = 1$, we let $|\mathcal{U}| = \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i|$. For $\Omega \subset M$ we let also $\|\mathcal{U}\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} = \sum_i \|u_i\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)}$. The De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme for our systems is as follows.

Lemma 6.1. *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, be a continuous map. If $\mathcal{U} \in H_{1,p}^2(M)$ is a nonnegative p-map satisfying (6.3) in the sense of distributions, then $|\mathcal{U}| \in L^\infty(M)$. Moreover, for any $x \in M$, any $\Lambda > 0$, any $\delta > 0$, any $s \geq 1$, and any $q > 2^\star$, if $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies also that $\|\mathcal{U}\|_{L^q(B_x(2\delta))} \leq \Lambda$, then*

$$\max_{y \in B_x(\delta)} |\mathcal{U}(y)| \leq C \|\mathcal{U}\|_{L^s(B_x(2\delta))} \ , \tag{6.4}$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \ldots, u_p)$, $\mathcal{U} \not\equiv 0$, be a nonnegative p-map satisfying (6.3) in the sense of distributions. Applying a Trudinger type argument like in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we easily get that $\mathcal{U} \in L^k(M)$ for some $k > 2^\star$. In particular, the first claim in Lemma 6.1 follows from the second claim. Summing the different equations in (6.3), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g |\mathcal{U}| &\leq C|\mathcal{U}| + \sum_{i=1}^p u_i^{2^\star - 1} \\ &\leq C \left(1 + |\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star - 2}\right) |\mathcal{U}| \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on $\mathcal{U}$, $|\mathcal{U}| = \sum_{i=1}^p u_i$ since $\mathcal{U}$ is nonnegative, and the inequality is to be understood in the sense of distributions. Namely, (6.5) holds in the sense that

$$\int_M (\nabla|\mathcal{U}|\nabla\varphi)dv_g \leq C\int_M \left(1+|\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star-2}\right)|\mathcal{U}|\varphi dv_g \tag{6.6}$$

for all nonnegative $\varphi \in H_1^2(M)$. If $\|\mathcal{U}\|_{L^q(B_x(2\delta))} \leq \Lambda$ for some $q > 2^\star$, the function $f = |\mathcal{U}|^{2^\star-2}$ is bounded independently of $\mathcal{U}$ in $L^s(B_x(2\delta))$ for some $s > n/2$. In particular, by (6.6), we can apply the standard De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme for functions. We get that $\mathcal{U} \in L^\infty(M)$ if $\mathcal{U} \in L^k(M)$ for some $k > 2^\star$, and that for any $x \in M$, any $\Lambda > 0$, any $\delta > 0$, any $s > 0$, and any $q > 2^\star$, if $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies that $\|\mathcal{U}\|_{L^q(B_x(2\delta))} \leq \Lambda$, then (6.4) is true. This proves the lemma. □

Concerning the dependency of the constant C in (6.4) with respect to A, it easily follows from the above proof that C can be chosen to depend only on the C^0-norm of $K = \sum_{i,j}|A_{ij}|$. Another easy remark is that if A is cooperative, then $L_g u_i \leq u_i^{2^\star-1}$ for all i, where $L_g = \Delta_g + A_{ii}$, and the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme for functions can be applied directly to the u_i's.

Now that we have a De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme for our systems, we return to (6.1). We assume that (6.2) holds, and let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of solutions of (6.1). Namely, for any α, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ is a solution of (6.1). By the second equation in (6.2), there exists $C > 0$ such that for $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ sufficiently large, $I_{A(\alpha)}(\mathcal{U}) \geq CI_A(\mathcal{U})$ for all $\mathcal{U} \in H_{1,p}^2(M)$, where $I_{A(\alpha)}$ and I_A are as in (2.4). By (6.1) and the coercivity assumption in (6.2) we then get that for $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star}dv_g &\geq C_1 I_A(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)\\ &\geq C_2\left(\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star}dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are independent of α. In particular, when we assume (6.2), there exists $K > 0$ such that for any sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of solutions of (6.1), and any $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$, $\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star}dv_g \geq K$ if $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \not\equiv 0$. Now L^2-concentration states as follows. For $\mathcal{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_p)$, we write $\|\mathcal{U}\|_2 = \sum_i \|u_i\|_2$.

Theorem 6.1 (L^2-concentration). *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 4$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$, $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, be a sequence of smooth maps satisfying (6.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \not\equiv 0$, be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (6.1) such that $\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_2 \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Then, up to a subsequence, $\mathcal{S}_{geom} \neq \emptyset$ and*

$$\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty}\frac{\int_{\mathcal{B}_\delta}|\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2dv_g}{\int_M|\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2dv_g} = 1 \tag{6.7}$$

for all $\delta > 0$, where $\mathcal{B}_\delta = \bigcup_{i=1}^m B_{x_i}(\delta)$, and the x_i's are the geometrical blow-up points of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s, namely $\mathcal{S}_{geom} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$.

When $n = 3$, bubbles do not concentrate in the L^2-norm, and L^2-concentration turns out to be false when $n = 3$. Dimension 4 is the smallest dimension for which we can get L^2-concentration.

Proof. Up to a subsequence, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1 apply to the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. Since $\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_2 \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, we have that $\mathcal{U}^0 \equiv 0$ in (4.9). If in addition $\mathcal{S}_{geom} = \emptyset$, we would get by (5.14) that $|\mathcal{U}_\alpha| \to 0$ uniformly in M as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and this is in contradiction with the lower bound $\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g \geq K$ we discussed above. In other words, up to a subsequence, there is a nonempty finite set $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$ of geometrical blow-up points for the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. By the second equation in (6.2), there exists $C > 0$ such that for $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ sufficiently large, $I_{A(\alpha)}(\mathcal{U}) \geq C I_A(\mathcal{U})$ for all $\mathcal{U} \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$, where $I_{A(\alpha)}$ and I_A are as in (2.4). Let $f = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$ be a smooth map such that $f_i > 0$ in M for all i. For instance, $f_i \equiv 1$ for all i. Minimizing $I_{A(\alpha)}$ over the constraint $\sum_i \int_M f_i u_i dv_g = 1$, we easily get the existence of $\mathcal{W}_\alpha \in H^2_{1,p}(M)$ such that

$$\Delta_g^p \mathcal{W}_\alpha + A(\alpha)\mathcal{W}_\alpha = f \tag{6.8}$$

for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. By the coercivity assumption and (6.8), $\|\mathcal{W}_\alpha\|_2 \leq C$, and by standard regularity results, we get that $\mathcal{W}_\alpha$ is smooth and that there exists $K > 0$ such that $|\mathcal{W}_\alpha| \leq K$ in M for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. Then, by (6.8), since $f_i > 0$ for all i, and $|\mathcal{W}_\alpha| \leq K$, we can write that for any $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M u_\alpha^i dv_g &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M f_i u_\alpha^i dv_g \\ &= C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M \left(\Delta_g w_\alpha^i + \sum_j A_{ij}^\alpha w_\alpha^j\right) u_\alpha^i dv_g \\ &= C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M \left(\Delta_g u_\alpha^i + \sum_j A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^j\right) w_\alpha^i dv_g \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M |w_\alpha^i| (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α, and $\mathcal{W}_\alpha = (w_\alpha^1, \dots, w_\alpha^p)$. In particular, by (6.9), there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha| dv_g \leq C \int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g \tag{6.10}$$

for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$. We refer to (6.10) as the $L^1/L^{2^\star-1}$-controlled balance property of the system (6.1). Up to a subsequence, (6.10) holds for all α. Now, for $\delta > 0$, we let $\mathcal{B}_\delta$ be as in the statement of the theorem, and let $R_\delta(\alpha)$ be the ratio

$$R_\delta(\alpha) = \frac{\int_{M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta} |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g}{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g} \ . \tag{6.11}$$

Thanks, for instance, to Theorem 5.1, we can apply the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme in Lemma 6.1 to the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s in $M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta$ with $s = 2$. By the $L^1/L^{2^\star-1}$-controlled balance (6.10), and the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme, we then get that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta} |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g &\leq \left(\max_{M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta} |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|\right) \int_{M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta} |\mathcal{U}_\alpha| dv_g \\ &\leq C\sqrt{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g} \int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α. In particular,

$$R_\delta(\alpha) \le C \frac{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g}} \tag{6.12}$$

for all α, where $C > 0$ is independent of α. If we assume now that $n \ge 6$, then $2^\star - 1 \le 2$, and we can write with Hölder's inequality that

$$\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \le V_g^{\frac{3-2^\star}{2}} \left(\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \right)^{\frac{2^\star-1}{2}}$$

for all i, where V_g is the volume of M with respect to g. In particular, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g \le C \left(\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g \right)^{\frac{2^\star-1}{2}} ,$$

and since $2^\star > 2$ and $\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_2 \to 0$, we get with (6.12) that $R_\delta(\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. This proves (6.7) when $n \ge 6$. If $n = 5$, then $2 \le 2^\star - 1 \le 2^\star$, and we can write with Hölder's inequality that

$$\left(\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \right)^{\frac{1}{2^\star-1}} \le \left(\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \right)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \left(\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dv_g \right)^{\frac{1-\theta}{2^\star}} ,$$

where $\theta = \frac{3}{2(2^\star-1)}$. Since the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is bounded in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g \le C$ for all α. Then we get that

$$\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g \le C \left(\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} ,$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on α, and since $\frac{3}{4} > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_2 \to 0$, we get with (6.12) that $R_\delta(\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. This proves (6.7) when $n = 5$. Now it remains to prove (6.7) when $n = 4$. The argument when $n = 4$ is slightly more delicate and requires the H_1^2-theory in Section 4. We start writing that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star-1} dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g}} &= \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g}} \\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g}} . \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, p$, we let the $x_{j,\alpha}^i$'s and $\mu_{j,\alpha}^i$'s be the centers and weights of the 1-bubbles $(B_{j,\alpha}^i)_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined, where $j = 1, \dots, k_i$, and $\sum_i k_i = k$. For $R > 0$, and $i = 1, \dots, p$, we let also $\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)$ be given by

$$\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k_i} B_{x_{j,\alpha}^i}(R\mu_{j,\alpha}^i) , \tag{6.14}$$

and $\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)=\emptyset$ if $u^i_\alpha\to 0$ in $H^2_1(M)$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$. We fix $i=1,\dots,p$. Since $2^\star=4$, we can write, thanks to Hölder's inequalities, that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g &\le \int_{\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g\\ &\quad+\sqrt{\int_{M\backslash\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star}dv_g}\sqrt{\int_M (u^i_\alpha)^2dv_g}\end{aligned}$$

Then we get that

$$\frac{\int_M (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M (u^i_\alpha)^2dv_g}}\le\sqrt{\int_{M\backslash\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star}dv_g}+\frac{\int_{\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g}{\sqrt{\int_M (u^i_\alpha)^2dv_g}}\ , \tag{6.15}$$

where $\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)$ is as in (6.14). For $\varphi\in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of smooth functions with compact support in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}$ be the function defined by the equation

$$\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}(x)=(\mu^i_{j,\alpha})^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}\varphi\left((\mu^i_{j,\alpha})^{-1}\exp^{-1}_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(x)\right)\ . \tag{6.16}$$

Straightforward computations give that for any $j_1\ne j_2$, any i, and any α,

(i) $\int_M (B^i_{j_2,\alpha})^{2^\star-1}\varphi^i_{j_1,\alpha}dv_g=o(1)$,

where $o(1)\to 0$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$. Similarly, for any $R>0$, any i, any j, and any α,

(ii) $\int_{M\backslash\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star}dv_g=\varepsilon_R(\alpha)$,

(iii) $\int_{\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star-1}\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}dv_g=\int_{B_0(R)}u^{2^\star-1}\varphi dx+o(1)$,

(iv) $\int_{\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(B^i_{j,\alpha})^2(\varphi^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star-2}dv_g=\int_{B_0(R)}u^2\varphi^{2^\star-2}dx+o(1)$

where u is as in (4.5), $\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)=B_{x^i_{j,\alpha}}(R\mu^i_{j,\alpha})$, $o(1)\to 0$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$, and the $\varepsilon_R(\alpha)$'s are such that

$$\lim_{R\to+\infty}\limsup_{\alpha\to+\infty}\varepsilon_R(\alpha)=0\ . \tag{6.17}$$

By (ii) we can write that

$$\int_{M\backslash\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star}dv_g=\varepsilon_R(\alpha)\ , \tag{6.18}$$

where $\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)$ is as in (6.14), and the $\varepsilon_R(\alpha)$'s are such that (6.17) holds. From now on, we let φ in (6.16) be such that $\varphi=1$ in $B_0(R)$. Then,

$$\int_{\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g\le\sum_{j=1}^{k_i}(\mu^i_{j,\alpha})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\int_{\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}dv_g$$

while, thanks to (i) and (iii),

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}dv_g &\le C\int_{\Omega^i_{j,\alpha}(R)}(B^i_{j,\alpha})^{2^\star-1}\varphi^i_{j,\alpha}dv_g+o(1)\\ &\le C\int_{B_0(R)}u^{2^\star-1}dx+o(1)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and $C > 0$ does not depend on α and R. In particular, we can write that

$$\int_{\Omega_{i,\alpha}(R)} (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \le \left(C \int_{B_0(R)} u^{2^\star-1} dx + o(1) \right) \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} , \tag{6.19}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, u is as in (4.5), k_i is as in (4.10), and $C > 0$ does not depend on α and R. Independently, for any j,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g &\ge \int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \\ &\ge (\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{n-2} \int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} (u_\alpha^i)^2 (\varphi_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} dv_g \end{aligned}$$

Here, $2^\star - 2 = 2$. As is easily checked, we can write with (4.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} (u_\alpha^i)^2 (\varphi_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} dv_g \\ &= \int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{k_i} B_{m,\alpha}^i \right)^2 (\varphi_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} dv_g + o(1) \\ &\ge \int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^2 (\varphi_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} dv_g + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

and thanks to (iv) we get that

$$\int_{\Omega_{j,\alpha}^i(R)} (u_\alpha^i)^2 (\varphi_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} dv_g \ge \int_{B_0(R)} u^2 dx + o(1) .$$

Hence, for any j,

$$\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \ge (\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{n-2} \left(\int_{B_0(R)} u^2 dx + o(1) \right)$$

and we can write that

$$\int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \ge \left(\max_{j=1,\dots,k_i} \mu_{j,\alpha}^i \right)^{n-2} \left(\int_{B_0(R)} u^2 dx + o(1) \right) , \tag{6.20}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, k_i is as in (4.10), and u is as in (4.5). Then, since i is arbitrary, we get by combining (6.12), (6.13), (6.15), (6.18), (6.19), and (6.20) that, for any $R > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\alpha \to +\infty} R_\delta(\alpha) \le \varepsilon_R + C \frac{\int_{B_0(R)} u^{2^\star-1} dx}{\sqrt{\int_{B_0(R)} u^2 dx}} , \tag{6.21}$$

where $\varepsilon_R \to 0$ as $R \to +\infty$, and $C > 0$ does not depend on R. It is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R \to +\infty} \int_{B_0(R)} u^{2^\star-1} dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{2^\star-1} dx \\ &< +\infty \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when $n = 4$,

$$\lim_{R \to +\infty} \int_{B_0(R)} u^2 dx = +\infty .$$

Coming back to (6.21), it follows that $R_\delta(\alpha) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and (6.7) when $n = 4$ is true. This ends the proof of Theorem 6.1. $\square$

A possible estimate we could have add to L^2-concentration is the $L^2/\nabla L^2$-balance stating that for any $\delta > 0$, and any $x \in M$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_x(\delta)} |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2 dv_g \le C \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_x(2\delta)} \left(1 + (u_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-2}\right)(u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g \tag{6.22}$$

for all α, where the u_α^i's are the components of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. We prove (6.22) by mutliplying the ith equation of (6.1) by $\eta^2 u_\alpha^i$, and integrating over M, where η is such that $\eta = 0$ in $B_x(\delta)$ and $\eta = 1$ in $M \backslash B_x(2\delta)$. Using that by (6.2), there exists $C > 0$ such that $-A(\alpha) \le C Id_p$ for all α in the sense of bilinear forms, where Id_p is the $p \times p$-identity matrix in $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, we get (6.22). In particular, it follows from (6.22), the pointwise estimate in Section 5, and L^2-concentration, that

$$\int_{M\backslash\mathcal{B}_\delta} |\nabla \mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g = o\left(\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 dv_g\right)$$

for all α, where $|\nabla\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p |\nabla u_\alpha^i|^2$, $|\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p (u_\alpha^i)^2$, $\mathcal{B}_\delta = \bigcup_{i=1}^m B_{x_i}(\delta)$, and the x_i's are the geometrical blow-up points of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s.

7. Sharp pointwise asymptotics

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \ge 3$, $p \ge 1$ integer, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$. We let also $A(\alpha) = (A_{ij}^\alpha)$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}^\alpha(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{7.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume as in Section 6 that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists a $C^{0,\theta}$-map $A : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_g^p + A \text{ is coercive, and} \\ &A_{ij}^\alpha \to A_{ij} \text{ in } C^{0,\theta}(M) \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the second equation in (7.2) should hold for all i, j. The limit system we get by combining (7.1) and (7.2) reads as

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{7.3}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. The goal in this section is to prove sharp pointwise asymptotics for sequences of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) when standing close to one specific bubble of the H_1^2-decomposition of Theorem 4.1.

Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \not\equiv 0$, be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1). Then the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for (7.1) and we can apply Theorem 4.1. In particular, up to a subsequence, (4.9) and (4.10) hold. In what follows, we assume that the sequence blows up and let the $x_{j,\alpha}^i$'s and $\mu_{j,\alpha}^i$'s be the centers and weights of the 1-bubbles $(B_{j,\alpha}^i)_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles

$(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined, where $i = 1, \dots, p$, $j = 1, \dots, k_i$, and $\sum_i k_i = k$. Up to renumbering, and up to a subsequence, we may assume that

$$\mu_{1,\alpha}^1 = \max_{i,j} \mu_{j,\alpha}^i \ . \tag{7.4}$$

Then we let μ_α stand for $\mu_{1,\alpha}^1$, so that μ_α is the largest weight among all the possible weights $\mu_{j,\alpha}^i$, and we let x_α stand for $x_{1,\alpha}^1$, so that x_α is the corresponding $x_{j,\alpha}^i$. In other words, up to renumbering, and up to a subsequence, we assume (7.4), and then let

$$\mu_\alpha = \mu_{1,\alpha}^1 \text{ and } x_\alpha = x_{1,\alpha}^1 \tag{7.5}$$

for all α. We let also $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha$ be the p-map defined in the Euclidean ball $B_0(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ centered at 0 and of radius 1 by $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha = (\tilde{u}_\alpha^1, \dots, \tilde{u}_\alpha^p)$ and

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha^i(x) = u_\alpha^i \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}\left(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha} x\right)\right) \tag{7.6}$$

for all α, where $\exp_{x_\alpha}$ is the exponential map at x_α, and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha^1, \dots, u_\alpha^p)$. The terminology harmonic in Theorem 7.1 below refers to the Euclidean Laplacian. Namely $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is harmonic, where Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, if $\Delta\varphi = 0$ in Ω, where Δ is the Euclidean Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 7.1 (Sharp Asymptotics)**.** *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ an integer, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (7.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. Then there exist $\delta > 0$, nonnegative real numbers A_i, and harmonic functions $\varphi_i : B_0(\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that, up to a subsequence, for any i,*

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha^i(x) \to \frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_i(x) \tag{7.7}$$

in $C_{loc}^1\left(B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the $\tilde{u}_\alpha^i$'s are given by (7.6). If the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then at least one of the A_i's is positive. If the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, the limit system (7.3) is fully coupled, and $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is as in Theorem 4.1, then the φ_i's are positive functions in $B_0(\delta)$ for all i.

We prove Theorem 7.1 in several steps (Steps 7.1 to 7.8 below). For p_1 and p_2 such that $2^\star/2 < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1$, and $\sigma > 0$, we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}$ on $L^\infty(M)$, the space of bounded functions in M, by

$$\|u\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma} = \inf\left\{C > 0 \text{ s.t. } (I_{p_1,p_2}^\sigma) \text{ holds for } u\right\} ,$$

where (I_{p_1,p_2}^σ) holds for u if there exist nonnegative functions $u^1, u^2 \in L^\infty(M)$ such that $|u| \leq u^1 + u^2$, $\|u^1\|_{p_1} \leq C$, and

$$\|u^2\|_{p_2} \leq C\sigma^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}} \ .$$

For the sake of completeness, we mention the following specific (and easy) result from elliptic theory that we will repeatedly use in the proof of Steps 7.1 to 7.3. Namely that if $u \in H_2^p(M)$ and $f \in L^p(M)$, $p > 1$, are such that $\Delta_g u + \lambda u = f$ for some $\lambda > 0$, then $\|u\|_{H_2^p} \leq C\|f\|_p$ where $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, p, and λ. In order to prove this we write that

$$\|u\|_{H_2^p} \leq C\left(\|u\|_p + \|L_\lambda u\|_p\right) \ , \tag{7.8}$$

where $L_\lambda = \Delta_g + \lambda$, and $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, p, and λ. Equation (7.8) follows from standard elliptic theory. Then, by (7.8), it suffices to prove that $\|u\|_p \le C\|L_\lambda u\|_p$ where $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, p, and λ. We proceed by contradiction and assume that there exists a sequence (u_α) in $H_2^p(M)$ such that $\|u_\alpha\|_p = 1$ for all α and $\|L_\lambda u_\alpha\|_p \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By (7.8), the sequence (u_α) is bounded in $H_2^p(M)$. By compactness of the embedding of H_2^p in H_1^p, up to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_\alpha \to u$ in H_1^p. Then $\|u\|_p = 1$ while $L_\lambda u = 0$. But $L_\lambda u = 0$ implies $u = 0$ since $\lambda > 0$. A contradiction and this proves that if $u \in H_2^p(M)$ and $f \in L^p(M)$, $p > 1$, are such that $\Delta_g u + \lambda u = f$, for some $\lambda > 0$, then $\|u\|_{H_2^p} \le C\|f\|_p$ where $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, p, and λ.

Step 7.1 in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is as follows. In the sequel, once and for all, the $A(\alpha)$'s are assumed to satisfy (7.2). We will also always assume, up to passing to a subsequence, that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s satisfy (4.9) and (4.10).

Step 7.1. *Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. There exists $p(n) > 2^\star$ with the property that for any p_1, p_2 such that*

$$p_0(n) < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1 < p(n) \ , \tag{7.9}$$

where $p_0(n) = \max(\frac{2n}{n+2}, \frac{n}{n-2})$, there exists $C > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence, for any i, and any α,

$$\|u_\alpha^i\|_{p_1,p_2,\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \le C \ , \tag{7.10}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha^1, \dots, u_\alpha^p)$, and μ_α is as in (7.4)–(7.5).

Proof of Step 7.1. We fix $\lambda > 0$ and let G be the Green's function of the operator $\Delta_g + \lambda$. By (7.1) and (7.2), we may write that

$$\begin{aligned} u_\alpha^i(x) &= \int_M G(x,y) u_\alpha^i(y)^{2^\star-1} dv_g(y) - \sum_{j=1}^p \int_M \left(A_{ij}^\alpha - \lambda\delta_{ij}\right) G(x,y) u_\alpha^j(y) dv_g(y) \\ &\le \int_M G(x,y) u_\alpha^i(y)^{2^\star-1} dv_g(y) + C \sum_{j=1}^p \int_M G(x,y) u_\alpha^j(y) dv_g(y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $x \in M$, where $C > 0$ is independent of α, x, and i, and where the notation $dv_g(y)$ emphasizes that integration is with respect to y. By the H_1^2-theory, Theorem 4.1, writing that $u_\alpha^i(y)^{2^\star-1} = u_\alpha^i(y)^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i(y)$, we then get that

$$\begin{aligned} u_\alpha^i(x) \le C_1 &\sum_{j=1}^p \int_M G(x,y) u_\alpha^j(y) dv_g(y) \\ &+ C_2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \int_M G(x,y) B_{j,\alpha}^i(y)^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i(y) dv_g(y) \\ &+ C_3 \int_M G(x,y) |R_\alpha^i(y)|^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i(y) dv_g(y) \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $x \in M$, where C_1, C_2, C_3 are positive constants independent of α, x, and i, and where k_i, the 1-bubbles $B_{j,\alpha}^i$, and the remaining terms R_α^i are as in (4.9) and (4.10). Let w_α be the function given by

$$w_\alpha(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_M G(x,y) u_\alpha^j(y) dv_g(y) \ . \tag{7.12}$$

Then $\Delta_g w_\alpha + \lambda w_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^p u_\alpha^j$, and since the right hand side in this equation is bounded in $L^{2^\star}(M)$, independently of α, it follows from elliptic theory that the sequence consisting of the w_α's is bounded in $H_2^{2^\star}(M)$. In particular, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, there exists a dimensional constant $p(n) > 2^\star$ such that

$$\|w_\alpha\|_{p_1} \le C \tag{7.13}$$

for all α and all $2^\star \le p_1 \le p(n)$, where $C > 0$ is independent of α, and w_α is given by (7.12). Similarly, if we let $w_{j,\alpha}^i$ be the function given by

$$w_{j,\alpha}^i(x) = \int_M G(x,y) B_{j,\alpha}^i(y)^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i(y) dv_g(y) \ , \tag{7.14}$$

then

$$\Delta_g w_{j,\alpha}^i + \lambda w_{j,\alpha}^i = (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i \ . \tag{7.15}$$

Let $1 < q < r$ be such that $1/q = (1/r) + (1/2^\star)$. We can write that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i\|_q &\le \|(B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2}\|_r \|u_\alpha^i\|_{2^\star} \\ &\le C \|(B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2^\star-2}\|_r \ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α, i, and j. Moreover, by the equation (4.4) of a 1-bubble, we can write that for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\int_M (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{(2^\star-2)r} dv_g = \int_{B_\delta} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{(2^\star-2)r} dv_g + O\left((\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{2r}\right) \ ,$$

where $B_\delta = B_{x_{j,\alpha}^i}(\delta)$, and the $x_{j,\alpha}^i$'s and $\mu_{j,\alpha}^i$'s are the centers and weights of the 1-bubble $(B_{j,\alpha}^i)$, while we also have that

$$\int_{B_\delta} (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{(2^\star-2)r} dv_g \le C (\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{n-2r}$$

if $r > n/4$, where $C > 0$ is independent of α, i, and j. In particular, if $r \in \left(\frac{n}{4}, \frac{n}{2}\right)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M (B_{j,\alpha}^i)^{(2^\star-2)r} dv_g &\le C (\mu_{j,\alpha}^i)^{n-2r} \\ &\le C (\mu_\alpha)^{n-2r} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α, i, and j, and where μ_α is as in (7.4)–(7.5). By elliptic theory, (7.15), (7.16), and (7.17), we then get that the sequence consisting of the $w_{j,\alpha}^i$'s is bounded in $H_2^q(M)$ where $1/q = (1/r) + (1/2^\star)$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem, since r is arbitrary in $\left(\frac{n}{4}, \frac{n}{2}\right)$, it easily follows that

$$\|w_{j,\alpha}^i\|_{p_2} \le C (\mu_\alpha^{-1})^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}} \tag{7.18}$$

for all $p_2 \in \left(\frac{2n}{n+2}, 2^\star\right)$, α, i, and j, where $C > 0$ is independent of α, i, and j, and $w_{j,\alpha}^i$ is given by (7.14). At last, we let w_α^i be the function given by

$$w_\alpha^i(x) = \int_M G(x,y) |R_\alpha^i(y)|^{2^\star-2} u_\alpha^i(y) dv_g(y) \ . \tag{7.19}$$

Then

$$\Delta_g w_\alpha^i + \lambda w_\alpha^i = |R_\alpha^i|^{2^\star - 2} u_\alpha^i$$

and by Step 7.2 below, since $R_\alpha^i \to 0$ in H_1^2 as $\alpha \to +\infty$, we can write that if $2^\star/2 < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_\alpha^i\|_{p_1,p_2,\mu_\alpha^{-1}} &\leq C \|(R_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-2}\|_{n/2} \|u_\alpha^i\|_{p_1,p_2,\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \\ &= o\left(\|u_\alpha^i\|_{p_1,p_2,\mu_\alpha^{-1}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

for all α and i, where w_α^i is given by (7.19). Combining (7.11), (7.13), (7.18), and (7.20), it follows that there exists a dimensional constant $p(n) > 2^\star$ such that

$$\|u_\alpha^i\|_{p_1,p_2,\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \leq C$$

for all α and i, and all p_1, p_2 such that $p_0(n) < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1 < p(n)$, where $p_0(n)$ is as in Step 7.1, and $C > 0$ is independent of α, and i. In particular, (7.9) and (7.10) are true. This proves Step 7.1. ☐

Step 7.2 that we used in Step 7.1 is as follows.

Step 7.2. *Let $u, v \in H_1^2(M) \cap L^\infty(M)$ and $K \in L^\infty(M)$ be nonnegative functions such that*

$$\Delta_g u + \lambda u \leq K v$$

in M, where $\lambda > 0$. Let p_1, p_2 be such that $2^\star/2 < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1$. Then

$$\|u\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma} \leq C \|K\|_{n/2} \|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}$$

for all $\sigma > 0$, where $C > 0$ is independent of u, v, and σ.

Proof of Step 7.2. Let $\Lambda > \|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}$. Then there exist $v_1, v_2 \geq 0$ in $L^\infty(M)$ such that $v \leq v_1 + v_2$, $\|v_1\|_{p_1} \leq \Lambda$, and $\|v\|_{p_2} \leq \Lambda \sigma^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}}$. Let u_1, u_2 be such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_g u_1 + \lambda u_1 = K v_1 \text{ , and} \\ &\Delta_g u_2 + \lambda u_2 = K v_2 \text{ .} \end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

Then u_1 and u_2 are nonnegative functions in $H_2^p(M)$ for all $p > 1$, in particular $u_1, u_2 \in L^\infty(M)$, and since $\Delta_g \left(u - \sum u_i\right) + \lambda \left(u - \sum u_i\right) \leq 0$, we also have that $u \leq u_1 + u_2$. Let q_1 and q_2 be such that $1/q_i = (1/p_i) + (2/n)$, $i = 1, 2$. Since $p_i > 2^\star/2$, we have that $q_i > 1$, and we can also write that

$$\|K v_i\|_{q_i} \leq \|K\|_{n/2} \|v_i\|_{p_i} \text{ ,} \tag{7.22}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. By elliptic theory, (7.21), (7.22), and the Sobolev embedding theorem we then get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_i\|_{p_i} &\leq C \|u_i\|_{H_2^{q_i}} \\ &\leq C \|K\|_{n/2} \|v_i\|_{p_i} \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2$, where $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, λ, and the p_i's, $i = 1, 2$. Since $u \leq u_1 + u_2$, it follows that $\|u\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma} \leq C \|K\|_{n/2} \Lambda$, and since $\Lambda > \|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}$ is arbitrary, Step 7.2 is proved. ☐

The next step in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is as follows. In its statement, we let $\theta(n)$ be given by $\theta(n) = \frac{n(n+2)}{2(n-2)}$.

Step 7.3. *Let* $u, v, w \in H_1^2(M) \cap L^\infty(M)$*,* $u, v \geq 0$*, be such that*

$$\Delta_g u + \lambda u = v^{2^\star - 1} + w \tag{7.23}$$

in M*, where* $\lambda > 0$*. Let* p_1, p_2 *be such that* $2^\star - 1 < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1 < \theta(n)$*, and* q_1, q_2 *be such that* $\frac{1}{q_i} = \frac{2^\star - 1}{p_i} - \frac{2}{n}$*, for* $i = 1, 2$*. Then*

$$\|u\|_{q_1,q_2,\sigma} \leq C\left(1 + \max\left(\|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}, \|w\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}\right)^{2^\star - 1}\right) \tag{7.24}$$

for all $\sigma > 0$*, where* $C > 0$ *is independent of* u*,* v*,* w*, and* σ*.*

Proof of Step 7.3. Let $\Lambda > \max\left(\|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}, \|w\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}\right)$. Then there exist nonnegative functions f_1, f_2, f_1', and f_2' in $L^\infty(M)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & v \leq f_1 + f_2\ ,\ \|f_1\|_{p_1} \leq \Lambda\ ,\ \|f_2\|_{p_2} \leq \Lambda \sigma^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}}\ ,\ \text{and} \\ & |w| \leq f_1' + f_2'\ ,\ \|f_1'\|_{p_1} \leq \Lambda\ ,\ \|f_2'\|_{p_2} \leq \Lambda \sigma^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.25}$$

We let $D = D(n)$, $D > 0$ depending only on n, be such that

$$\begin{aligned} v^{2^\star - 1} + w &\leq v^{2^\star - 1} + |w| \\ &\leq D\left((f_1 + f_1')^{2^\star - 1} + 1\right) + D\left(f_2 + f_2'\right)^{2^\star - 1} \end{aligned}$$

and let H_1, H_2 be given by $H_1 = D\left((f_1 + f_1')^{2^\star - 1} + 1\right)$ and $H_2 = D\left(f_2 + f_2'\right)^{2^\star - 1}$. We also define u_1 and u_2 by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_g u_1 + \lambda u_1 = H_1\ ,\ \text{and} \\ & \Delta_g u_2 + \lambda u_2 = H_2\ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.26}$$

Then u_1, u_2 are nonnegative functions in H_2^p for all $p > 1$. In particular, we have that $u_1, u_2 \in L^\infty(M)$, and by elliptic theory and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we can write that

$$\|u_i\|_{q_i} \leq C\|u_i\|_{H_2^{\tilde{p}_i}} \leq C\|H_i\|_{\tilde{p}_i} \tag{7.27}$$

for $i = 1, 2$, where $1/q_i = (1/\tilde{p}_i) - (2/n)$, $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/(2^\star - 1)$, and $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold, λ and the p_i's, $i = 1, 2$. By (7.23),

$$\Delta_g u + \lambda u \leq H_1 + H_2\ ,$$

and it follows from (7.26) and the maximum principle that $u \leq u_1 + u_2$. As is easily checked,

$$(2^\star - 1)\left(\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{p_2}\right) = \frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{q_2}\ .$$

It follows that $\|H_1\|_{\tilde{p}_1} \leq C\left(1 + \Lambda^{2^\star - 1}\right)$ and $\|H_2\|_{\tilde{p}_2} \leq C\Lambda^{2^\star - 1}\sigma^{\frac{n}{2^\star} - \frac{n}{q_2}}$, where $C > 0$ is independent of u, v, w, and σ. Since $\Lambda > \max\left(\|v\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}, \|w\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}\right)$ is arbitrary, and since $u \leq u_1 + u_2$, we get with (7.27) that (7.24) is true. This proves Step 7.3. $\square$

The next step in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is as follows. Estimates like in Step 7.4, where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma}$ is involved, have been introduced in Devillanova and Solimini [14].

Step 7.4. *Let* $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ *be a bounded sequence in* $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ *of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. Let* p_1, p_2 *be such that* $2^\star/2 < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1$*. There exist* $C > 0$ *and sequences* $(v^i_{1,\alpha})_\alpha$*,* $(v^i_{2,\alpha})_\alpha$ *of nonnegative functions in* $L^\infty(M)$ *such that, up to a subsequence,* $u^i_\alpha \le v^i_{1,\alpha} + v^i_{2,\alpha}$*,* $\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1} \le C$*, and*

$$\|v^i_{2,\alpha}\|_{p_2} \le C\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n}{p_2}-\frac{n}{2^\star}} \tag{7.28}$$

for all i *and* α*, where* $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$*, and* μ_α *is as in (7.4)–(7.5).*

Proof of Step 7.4. We prove Step 7.4 by induction, starting from Step 7.1, using Step 7.3. An easy remark is that

$$\|u\|_{\tilde{p}_1,p_2,\sigma} \le C\|u\|_{p_1,p_2,\sigma} \tag{7.29}$$

if $\tilde{p}_1 \le p_1$, where $C > 0$ depends only on the manifold. We fix p_1, p_2 such that $\frac{2^\star}{2} < p_2 < 2^\star < p_1$. We let $p^0_1 > 2^\star$ be close to $2^\star$, and let $k_0 \ge 1$ be such that the increasing sequence $(p^k_1)_k$ given by

$$\frac{1}{p_1^{k+1}} = \frac{2^\star - 1}{p_1^k} - \frac{2}{n}$$

satisfies $p^k_1 < \theta(n)$ for all $k \le k_0$, and $p_1^{k_0+1} \ge \theta(n)$, where $\theta(n)$ is as in Step 7.3. Similarly, for $p^0_2 < 2^\star$ we construct the decreasing sequence $(p^k_2)_k$ by

$$\frac{1}{p_2^{k+1}} = \frac{2^\star - 1}{p_2^k} - \frac{2}{n} \ .$$

We choose p^0_2 such that $p_2^{k_0+2} = p_2$. Then, since $p_2 > 2^\star/2$, we get that $p^k_2 > 2^\star - 1$ for all $k \le k_0 + 1$. The more $p^0_1 > 2^\star$ is close to $2^\star$, the more k_0 is large, and the more k_0 is large, the more $p^0_2 < 2^\star$ has to be close to $2^\star$. In particular, we can assume that $p^0_2 > 2^\star/(2^\star - 1)$. We fix $\lambda > 0$, and, by (7.1), we write that

$$\Delta_g u^i_\alpha + \lambda u^i_\alpha = (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1} + \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij} u^j_\alpha$$

for all i and α, where $\tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij} = \lambda\delta_{ij} - A^\alpha_{ij}$. In particular, by (7.2), there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij}\|_{C^0} \le C$ for all i, j, and α. Then, by Steps 7.1 and 7.3, we can write that there exists $C > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\|u^i_\alpha\|_{p_1^{k_0+1},p_2^{k_0+1},\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \le C$$

for all i and α. In particular, by (7.29), $\|u^i_\alpha\|_{\tilde{p}_1,p_2^{k_0+1},\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \le C$ for $\tilde{p}_1 < \theta(n)$ as close as we want to $\theta(n)$. We then apply Step 7.3 once more and get that

$$\|u^i_\alpha\|_{\hat{p}_1,p_2^{k_0+2},\mu_\alpha^{-1}} \le C \ ,$$

where $\hat{p}_1 \to +\infty$ as $\tilde{p}_1 \to \theta(n)$. Choosing $\tilde{p}_1$ sufficiently close to $\theta(n)$, we can assume that $\hat{p}_1 \ge p_1$, and, thanks to (7.29), we get that there exist $C > 0$ and sequences $(v^i_{1,\alpha})_\alpha$, $(v^i_{2,\alpha})_\alpha$ of nonnegative functions in $L^\infty(M)$ such that, up to a subsequence, $u^i_\alpha \le v^i_{1,\alpha} + v^i_{2,\alpha}$, $\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1} \le C$, and (7.28) holds. This proves Step 7.4. □

Going on with the proof of Theorem 7.1, we now prove integral estimates for sequences of nonnegative solutions of (7.1). Step 7.5 is as follows.

Step 7.5. *Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. There exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)} u^i_\alpha d\sigma_g \le C_1 + C_2\frac{\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{r^{n-2}} \tag{7.30}$$

for all i, all α, and all $r > 0$ sufficiently small, where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$, the x_α's and μ_α's are as in (7.4)–(7.5), and $d\sigma_g$ is the measure induced on $\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)$ by g.

Proof of Step 7.5. Thanks, for instance, to the Bishop-Gromov comparison theorem (see Chavel [9]), there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(B_{x_\alpha}(r)\right) \le Cr^n$ for all α and $r > 0$ small, where $\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(B_{x_\alpha}(r)\right)$ is the volume of the ball $B_{x_\alpha}(r)$. By (7.1) and (7.2) we may then write that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(\Delta_g u^i_\alpha)dv_g &= \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g - \sum_{j=1}^p\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)} A^\alpha_{ij}u^j_\alpha dv_g\\ &\le C\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}\Big((u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}+C\Big)dv_g\\ &\le Cr^n + C\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g\end{aligned} \tag{7.31}$$

for all α, i, and all $r > 0$ small, where the above constants $C > 0$ are independent of α, i, and r. By Step 7.4 that we apply to the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s with $p_1 = (2^\star - 1)n$ and $p_2 = 2^\star - 1$, there exist $C > 0$ and sequences $(v^i_{1,\alpha})_\alpha$, $(v^i_{2,\alpha})_\alpha$ of nonnegative functions in $L^\infty(M)$ such that, up to a subsequence, $u^i_\alpha \le v^i_{1,\alpha} + v^i_{2,\alpha}$, $\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1} \le C$, and $\|v^i_{2,\alpha}\|_{p_2} \le C\mu_\alpha^{(n/p_2)-(n/2^\star)}$ for all i and α. In particular, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}dv_g &\le C\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(v^i_{1,\alpha})^{2^\star-1}dv_g + C\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(v^i_{2,\alpha})^{2^\star-1}dv_g\\ &\le C\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1}^{2^\star-1}\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(B_{x_\alpha}(r)\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + C\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n}{p_2}-\frac{n}{2^\star}}\right)^{2^\star-1}\end{aligned} \tag{7.32}$$

for all α, i, and all $r > 0$ small, where the above constants $C > 0$ are, here again, independent of α, i, and r. Combining (7.31) and (7.32), we get that there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(\Delta_g u^i_\alpha)dv_g \le C_1 r^{n-1} + C_2\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{7.33}$$

for all α, i, and all $r > 0$ small. Given $x_0 \in M$, there exists β_{x_0} a smooth function around x_0 such that for u smooth in M, and $r > 0$ small (less than the injectivity radius of the manifold),

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dr}\left(\frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_{x_0}(r)} u\,d\sigma_g\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_{x_0}(r)}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu}\right)d\sigma_g + \frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_{x_0}(r)}\beta_{x_0}u\,d\sigma_g\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{7.34}$$

where $\partial B_{x_0}(r)$ is the boundary of the geodesic ball $B_{x_0}(r)$, where $d\sigma_g$ is the volume element on $\partial B_{x_0}(r)$ induced by g, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}$ is the normal derivative with respect to the outward unit normal vector ν. As is well known, see again Chavel [9], $\beta_{x_0}(x) = O'\left(d_g(x_0,x)\right)$ where the notation in the right hand side of this equation stands for a C^1-function such that the kth derivatives of this function, $k = 0,1$, are bounded by $Cd_g(x_0,x)^{1-k}$ where $C > 0$ does not depend on x_0 and x. For $i = 1,\dots,p$, we define $\Phi^i_\alpha : (0,\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\delta > 0$ small, by

$$\Phi^i_\alpha(r) = \frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{\partial B_{x_\alpha}(r)} u^i_\alpha dv_g \ .$$

Then, by (7.34), we can write that

$$\frac{d\Phi^i_\alpha}{dr}(r) = -\frac{1}{r^{n-1}}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(r)}(\Delta_g u^i_\alpha)dv_g + H^i_\alpha(r)\Phi^i_\alpha(r) \tag{7.35}$$

for all α, i, and all $r > 0$ small, where the H^i_α's are uniformly bounded with respect to α and r. By (5.14), there exists $\delta > 0$, δ arbitrarily small, with the property that, for any i, the $\Phi^i_\alpha(\delta)$'s are bounded uniformly with respect to α. Integrating (7.35) between r and δ, $0 < r < \delta$, we get that

$$-\left[e^{-\int_0^t H^i_\alpha(s)ds}\Phi^i_\alpha(t)\right]_r^\delta = \int_r^\delta\left(\frac{e^{-\int_0^t H^i_\alpha(s)ds}}{t^{n-1}}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(t)}(\Delta_g u^i_\alpha)dv_g\right)dt\ ,$$

and then, it follows from (7.33) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^i_\alpha(r) &\le Ce^{-\int_0^r H^i_\alpha(s)ds}\Phi^i_\alpha(r)\\ &\le Ce^{-\int_0^\delta H^i_\alpha(s)ds}\Phi^i_\alpha(\delta) + C\int_r^\delta\left(C_1 + C_2\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}t^{1-n}\right)dt\\ &\le C_3 + C_4\frac{1}{r^{n-2}}\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

for all α, i, and all $0 < r < \delta$, where C_1, C_2 are as in (7.33), and the constants C, C_3, and C_4 are positive and independent of α, i, and r. This proves (7.30) and Step 7.5. □

Now that we have Step 7.5, we can prove the first part of Theorem 7.1. This is the subject of the following step.

Step 7.6. *Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. There exist $\delta > 0$, nonnegative real numbers A_i, and harmonic functions $\varphi_i : B_0(\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1,\dots,p$, such that, up to a subsequence, for any i,*

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_i(x) \tag{7.36}$$

in $C^1_{loc}\left(B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the $\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$'s are given by (7.6).

Proof of Step 7.6. We let g_α be given by $g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp^\star_{x_\alpha} g\right)(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the x_α's and μ_α's are as in (7.4)–(7.5). Clearly, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ for any compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n$, where ξ is the Euclidean metric. We also have that

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha + \mu_\alpha\sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij}\tilde{u}^j_\alpha = \mu_\alpha(\tilde{u}^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1} \tag{7.37}$$

for all i, where $\tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij}(x) = A^\alpha_{ij}\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)\right)$. If the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s are the centers of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined, up to passing to a subsequence, we may assume that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any i, j, either $d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, x_\alpha) \le C\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$ for all α, or $d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, x_\alpha)/\sqrt{\mu_\alpha} \to +\infty$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is the finite set consisting of the i, j's such that $d_g(x^i_{j,\alpha}, x_\alpha) \le C\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$ for all α, we let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ be given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \left\{ \lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}} \exp^{-1}_{x_\alpha}(x^i_{j,\alpha}) \ ,\ i, j \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \tag{7.38}$$

where, up to passing to another subsequence, we assume that the limits in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ exist. Clearly, $0 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Given $0 < \delta < R$, we let $K = B'_0(R) \backslash \bigcup_{x\in\hat{\mathcal{S}}} B_x(\delta)$, where $B'_0(R)$ stands for the closed Euclidean ball of radius R centered at 0. We let also h^i_α be given by

$$h^i_\alpha = \mu_\alpha (\tilde{u}^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-2} \ . \tag{7.39}$$

Then, by (7.37), we can write that

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha} \tilde{u}^i_\alpha + \mu_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij} \tilde{u}^j_\alpha = h^i_\alpha \tilde{u}^i_\alpha \tag{7.40}$$

for all i, where the $\tilde{A}^\alpha_{ij}$'s are as in (7.37), and the h^i_α's are given by (7.39). By the estimate (5.3) in Theorem 5.1, that we apply to $\tilde{x}_\alpha = \exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)$, we easily get that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any i, and any $x \in K$, $|h^i_\alpha(x)| \le C$. We claim that by Lemma 5.1, we actually have that

$$h^i_\alpha \to 0 \ \text{ in } L^\infty(K) \tag{7.41}$$

for all i, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. In order to prove (7.41), we first note that there exists $C > 0$, $C = C(K)$, such that

$$d_g\left(x^i_{j,\alpha}, \exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)\right) \ge C\sqrt{\mu_\alpha} \tag{7.42}$$

for all α, i, j, and $x \in K$. Then, since μ_α is the largest weight among all the possible weights $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$, we get with (7.42) that

$$\frac{1}{\mu^i_{j,\alpha}} d_g\left(x^i_{j,\alpha}, \exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)\right) \to +\infty \tag{7.43}$$

in $L^\infty(K)$ for all i, j, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We may therefore apply Lemma 5.1 to the $\tilde{x}_\alpha = \exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x)$, and we get with this lemma and (7.42) that $h^i_\alpha \to 0$ in $L^\infty(K)$ for all i, as $\alpha \to +\infty$. This proves the above claim that (7.41) is true. Now that we proved (7.41), we claim that for any $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2$, and any $p \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right)$, there exists $C = C(\delta_1, \delta_2, p)$, $C > 0$, such that

$$\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} (\tilde{u}^i_\alpha)^p dv_{g_\alpha} \le C \tag{7.44}$$

for all α and i, where $R(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ is the Euclidean annulus centered at 0 and of radii δ_1, δ_2. In order to prove (7.44), we fix $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2$, $p \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right)$, and let $A(\alpha, \delta_1, \delta_2)$ be the annulus in M centered at x_α and of radii $\delta_1\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}, \delta_2\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}$. By the integral estimate (7.30) in Step 7.5, we can write that

$$\frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right)} \int_{A_n(\alpha)} u^i_\alpha dv_g \le C \tag{7.45}$$

for all α and i, where $A_n(\alpha) = A(\alpha, \delta_1, \delta_2)$, $\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right)$ is the volume of $A_n(\alpha)$ with respect to g, and $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. By (7.1) and (7.2), like in (7.31), we can also write that

$$\int_{A_n(\alpha)} |\Delta_g u^i_\alpha| dv_g \le C\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right) + C\sum_{k=1}^{p}\int_{A_n(\alpha)} (u^k_\alpha)^{2^\star-1} dv_g \tag{7.46}$$

for all α and i, where $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. By Step 7.4 that we apply to the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s with $p_1 = (2^\star - 1)n$ and $p_2 = 2^\star - 1$, there exist $C > 0$ and sequences $(v^i_{1,\alpha})_\alpha$, $(v^i_{2,\alpha})_\alpha$ of nonnegative functions in $L^\infty(M)$ such that, up to a subsequence, $u^i_\alpha \le v^i_{1,\alpha} + v^i_{2,\alpha}$, $\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1} \le C$, and $\|v^i_{2,\alpha}\|_{p_2} \le C\mu_\alpha^{(n/p_2)-(n/2^\star)}$ for all i and α. In particular, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{A_n(\alpha)} (u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1} dv_g &\le C\int_{A_n(\alpha)} (v^i_{1,\alpha})^{2^\star-1} dv_g + C\int_{A_n(\alpha)} (v^i_{2,\alpha})^{2^\star-1} dv_g \\ &\le C\|v^i_{1,\alpha}\|_{p_1}^{2^\star-1}\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + C\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n}{p_2}-\frac{n}{2^\star}}\right)^{2^\star-1} \\ &\le C\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + C\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\end{aligned} \tag{7.47}$$

for all α and i, where the above constants $C > 0$ are, here again, independent of α and i. Combining (7.46) and (7.47), we get that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_g\left(A_n(\alpha)\right)}\int_{A_n(\alpha)} |\Delta_g u^i_\alpha| dv_g \le \frac{C}{\mu_\alpha} \tag{7.48}$$

for all α and i. Then, by (7.45) and (7.48), we can write that

$$\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} \tilde{u}^i_\alpha dv_{g_\alpha} \le C \text{ and } \int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} |\Delta_{g_\alpha}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha| dv_{g_\alpha} \le C \tag{7.49}$$

for all α and i, where $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. We let F^i_α be such that $F^i_\alpha = \Delta_{g_\alpha}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$ in $R(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ and $F^i_\alpha = 0$ outside $R(\delta_1, \delta_2)$. Given $\delta > \delta_2$ we let also G_α be the Green's function of Δ_{g_α} in $B_0(\delta)$ with zero Dirichlet boundary condition, and set

$$v^i_\alpha(x) = \int_{B_0(\delta)} G_\alpha(x, y) F^i_\alpha(y) dv_{g_\alpha}(y) .$$

By standard properties of the Green's function, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$G_\alpha(x, y) \le \frac{C}{|y - x|^{n-2}} \tag{7.50}$$

for all $x \in R(\delta_1, \delta_2)$, all $y \in B_0(\delta)$, and all α. Given $p \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right)$, we let q be such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. For $\varphi \in L^q\left(R(\delta_1, \delta_2)\right)$, by (7.50), we can write that

$$\left|\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} v^i_\alpha \varphi dx\right| \le C\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)}\left(\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} \frac{\varphi(x)}{|y - x|^{n-2}} dx\right)\left|F^i_\alpha(y)\right| dy .$$

By Hölder's inequality, since $p < \frac{n}{n-2}$, we then get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} v_\alpha^i \varphi dx\right|\\ &\le C\|\varphi\|_{L^q(R(\delta_1,\delta_2))}\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)}\left(\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)}\frac{dx}{|y-x|^{p(n-2)}}\right)^{1/p}\left|F_\alpha^i(y)\right|dy\\ &\le C\|\varphi\|_{L^q(R(\delta_1,\delta_2))}\left\|F_\alpha^i\right\|_{L^1(R(\delta_1,\delta_2))}\end{aligned}$$

and, by (7.49), it follows that

$$\left|\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} v_\alpha^i \varphi dx\right| \le C\|\varphi\|_{L^q(R(\delta_1,\delta_2))}$$

for all α and i, where $C > 0$ does not depend on α, i, and φ. Thus, by duality, taking $\varphi = (v_\alpha^i)^{p-1}$, we get that

$$\int_{R(\delta_1,\delta_2)} (v_\alpha^i)^p dv_{g_\alpha} \le C, \tag{7.51}$$

for all α and i, where $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. Since $\Delta_{g_\alpha}\left(v_\alpha^i - \tilde{u}_\alpha^i\right) = 0$ in $R(\delta_1,\delta_2)$, it follows from the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme that if $\Omega \subset\subset R(\delta_1,\delta_2)$, then

$$\sup_\Omega \left|v_\alpha^i - \tilde{u}_\alpha^i\right| \le C\left\|v_\alpha^i - \tilde{u}_\alpha^i\right\|_{L^1(R(\delta_1,\delta_2))} ,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of α and i. By (7.49) and (7.51), and since $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ are arbitrary, this implies the above claim that (7.44) is true. In particular, combining (7.40), (7.41), and (7.44), we get with standard elliptic theory (see, for instance, Theorem 9.11 in Gilbarg-Trudinger [22]) that the $\tilde{u}_\alpha^i$'s are uniformly bounded in $H_2^p(\Omega)$ for all $p \in \left(1, \frac{n}{n-2}\right)$, all i, and all $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. By standard bootstrap arguments, it follows that the $\tilde{u}_\alpha^i$'s are uniformly bounded in $H_2^p(\Omega)$ for all $p > 1$, all i, and all $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. By the Sobolev embedding theorem we may then assume that, up to a subsequence, and for all i, the $\tilde{u}_\alpha^i$'s converge in $C_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}})$ to some nonnegative $\tilde{u}_i$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. By (7.40), and (7.41), see also (7.2), the $\tilde{u}_i$'s are harmonic in $\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Let us now write that $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, where $x_1 = 0$. By classical results in harmonic analysis, see, for instance, Véron [54], since the $\tilde{u}_i$'s are both harmonic and nonnegative in $\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$, we can write that for any i, there exists a harmonic function $\psi_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, and real numbers $A_j^i \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\tilde{u}_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{A_j^i}{|x-x_j|^{n-2}} + \psi_i(x) \tag{7.52}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Since $\tilde{u}_i \ge 0$, the harmonic function ψ_i is bounded from below. By Liouville's theorem we then get that ψ_i is constant. Clearly, since $\tilde{u}_i \ge 0$, we also have that the A_j^i's are nonnegative. Letting φ_i be given by

$$\varphi_i(x) = \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{A_j^i}{|x-x_j|^{n-2}} + \psi_i , \tag{7.53}$$

the φ_i's are harmonic in $B_0(\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$ small, and nonnegative. Then, since the $\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$'s converge to $\tilde{u}_i$ in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n \backslash \hat{\mathcal{S}})$, we get with (7.52) and (7.53) that

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_i(x)$$

in $C^1_{loc}(B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\})$ for all i, where $A_i = A^i_1$ is nonnegative. In particular, (7.36) holds true, and this proves Step 7.6. $\square$

As a remark, note we proved a slightly more general result than the one in Step 7.6. Namely that there exists a finite subset $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, given by (7.38), such that, up to a subsequence, and for any i,

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{A^i_j}{|x - x_j|^{n-2}} + K_i \tag{7.54}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}})$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the A^i_j's and K_i's are nonnegative constants, and where the x_j's, $j = 1, \dots, m$, are the points in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. Now, going on with the proof of Theorem 7.1, we claim that if the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then at least one of the A_i's in (7.36) is positive. This is the best we can prove in the sense that it might be that one and only one of the A_i's is positive. Easy such examples (for instance, on the sphere) can be exhibited. Step 7.7 states as follows.

Step 7.7. *Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. If the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then at least one of the A_i's in (7.36) is positive.*

Proof of Step 7.7. We prove that if the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then we have that $A_i > 0$, where i is such that $x_\alpha = x^i_{j,\alpha}$ for some j, and the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s are the centers of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined. By (7.5), $i = 1$. We let L^α_g be the operator acting on functions given by $L^\alpha_g u = \Delta_g u + A^\alpha_{11} u$. By (7.2), the operators $\Delta_g + A(\alpha)$ are coercive for α sufficiently large. Up to passing to a subsequence, we can assume they are coercive for all α. Then, as is easily checked by considering p-maps like $\mathcal{U} = (u, 0, \dots, 0)$, L^α_g is also coercive for all α. We let G_α be the Green's function of L^α_g. By (7.2), and standard properties of Green's functions (see, for instance, appendix A in Druet, Hebey and Robert [20]), we can write that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$G_\alpha(x, y) \geq \frac{C}{d_g(x, y)^{n-2}} \tag{7.55}$$

for all α, and all $x \neq y$. Up to passing to another subsequence, we also assume in what follows that the ratios $d_g(x_\alpha, x^i_{j,\alpha})/\mu_\alpha$ have limits (possibly $+\infty$) as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all i, j, where the μ_α's are given by (7.4) and (7.5) . We let $\delta_1 < \delta_2$, $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, be such that $[\delta_1, \delta_2]$ does not contain any such limits. Then, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$d_g\left(x^i_{j,\alpha}, \exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \geq C\mu_\alpha \tag{7.56}$$

for all $x \in B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)$, all i, j, and all α (up to passing to a subsequence so that we only have to consider large α's). Let v^1_α be the function given by

$$v^1_\alpha(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^1_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \ . \tag{7.57}$$

By Theorem 5.1, and (7.56), there exists $C > 0$ such that $v_\alpha^1 \le C$ in $B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)$ for all α. In particular, we can write that

$$\int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} (v_\alpha^1)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} \le C \int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} (v_\alpha^1)^{2^\star - 1} dv_{g_\alpha} \tag{7.58}$$

where g_α is the metric given by $g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp_{x_\alpha}^\star g\right)(\mu_\alpha x)$. Clearly, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$ for all $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n$. By Theorem 4.1, and more precisely (4.10) that we consider for $i = 1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} (v_\alpha^1)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} &= \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)\backslash B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha)} (u_\alpha^1)^{2^\star} dv_g \\ &\ge \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)\backslash B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha)} B_\alpha^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1)\end{aligned} \tag{7.59}$$

for all α, where $(B_\alpha)_\alpha$ is the 1-bubble of center the x_α's and weights the μ_α's, and where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We also have that

$$\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)\backslash B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha)} B_\alpha^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} u^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} , \tag{7.60}$$

where u is given by (4.5). Combining (7.59) and (7.60), it follows that

$$\int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} (v_\alpha^1)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} \ge C \tag{7.61}$$

for all α, where $C > 0$ is independent of α, and the v_α^1's are given by (7.57). We let $\delta > 0$ small as in Step 7.6. For $x \in B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}$, $y \in B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)$, and α sufficiently large such that $x \ne \sqrt{\mu_\alpha} y$, we let also $\hat{G}_\alpha(x,y)$ be given by

$$\hat{G}_\alpha(x,y) = G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), \exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha y)\right) . \tag{7.62}$$

By (7.1), $L_g^\alpha u_\alpha^1 = (u_\alpha^1)^{2^\star-1} - \sum_{j\ne 1} A_{ij}^\alpha u_\alpha^j$. We fix x. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_\alpha^1(x) = &\int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)(u_\alpha^1)^{2^\star-1}(y) dv_g(y) \\ &- \sum_{j\ne 1}\int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right) A_{1j}^\alpha(y) u_\alpha^j(y) dv_g(y) ,\end{aligned} \tag{7.63}$$

and since we assumed that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, we can write that

$$\tilde{u}_\alpha^1(x) \ge \int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)(u_\alpha^1)^{2^\star-1}(y) dv_g(y) \tag{7.64}$$

for all α sufficiently large. By (7.64) we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_\alpha^1(x) &\ge \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_2\mu_\alpha)\backslash B_{x_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha)} G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)(u_\alpha^1)^{2^\star-1}(y) dv_g(y) \\ &\ge \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \int_{B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)} \hat{G}_\alpha(x,y)(v_\alpha^1)^{2^\star-1}(y) dv_{g_\alpha}(y) ,\end{aligned} \tag{7.65}$$

while, by (7.55),

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\hat{G}_\alpha(x,y) &\geq \frac{C\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}{\left|\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x-\mu_\alpha y\right|^{n-2}}\\ &\geq \frac{C}{\left|x-\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}y\right|^{n-2}}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{7.66}$$

for all $y \in B_0(\delta_2)\backslash B_0(\delta_1)$, and all α sufficiently large. Combining (7.58), (7.61), (7.65), and (7.66), we get that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{u}_1(x) \geq \frac{C}{|x|^{n-2}} \tag{7.67}$$

for all $x \in B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}$, where $\tilde{u}_1$ is the C^1_{loc}-limit of the $\tilde{u}^1_\alpha$'s (which exists by Step 7.6). By (7.36),

$$\tilde{u}_1(x) = \frac{A_1}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_1(x)\ , \tag{7.68}$$

for all $x \in B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}$, where φ_1 is harmonic in $B_0(\delta)$. In particular, it follows from (7.67) and (7.68) that $A_1 > 0$. This proves Step 7.7. $\square$

The last step in the proof of Theorem 7.1 is as follows.

Step 7.8. *Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. If the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, the limit system (7.3) is fully coupled, and $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is as in Theorem 4.1, then the φ_i's in (7.36) are positive functions in $B_0(\delta)$ for all i.*

Proof of Step 7.8. By (7.2), the limit map $-A$ is cooperative when the $-A(\alpha)$'s are assumed to be cooperative. Assuming that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, since the limit system (7.3) is also fully coupled and $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a solution of (7.3), we get, see Lemma 1.1 in Section 1, that $u^0_i > 0$ for all i, where the u^0_i's are the components of $\mathcal{U}^0$. We fix $i = 1,\dots,p$. Then we let L^α_g be the operator given by $L^\alpha_g u = \Delta_g u + A^\alpha_{ii}u$, and let G_α be the Green's function of L^α_g. As already mentionned, see (7.54), there exists a finite subset $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{A^i_j}{|x-x_j|^{n-2}} + K_i \tag{7.69}$$

in $C^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}})$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the A^i_j's and K_i's are nonnegative constants, and the x_j's, $j = 1,\dots,m$, are the points in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. We let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}$. Like in (7.63), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) &= \int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x),y\right)\left(u^i_\alpha\right)^{2^\star-1}(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\quad -\sum_{j\neq i}\int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x),y\right)A^\alpha_{ij}(y)u^j_\alpha(y)dv_g(y)\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{7.70}$$

for all α, where the x_α's and μ_α's are given by (7.4) and (7.5). Then, by (7.70),

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) &= \int_M G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\quad -\sum_{j\neq i}\int_{M\backslash B_{x_0}(r)} G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)A^\alpha_{ij}(y)u^j_\alpha(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\quad -\sum_{j\neq i}\int_{B_{x_0}(r)} G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)A^\alpha_{ij}(y)u^j_\alpha(y)dv_g(y)\end{aligned}$$

for all α and $r > 0$ small, where x_0 is the limit of the x_α's, and since the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \geq &\int_{M\backslash B_{x_0}(r)} G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)(u^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1}(y)dv_g(y)\\ &-\sum_{j\neq i}\int_{M\backslash B_{x_0}(r)} G_\alpha\left(\exp_{x_\alpha}(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}x), y\right)A^\alpha_{ij}(y)u^j_\alpha(y)dv_g(y)\end{aligned} \tag{7.71}$$

for all α and $r > 0$ small. Letting $\alpha \to +\infty$, it follows from (7.71) that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_i(x) &\geq \int_{M\backslash B_{x_0}(r)} G\left(x_0, y\right)(u^0_i)^{2^\star-1}(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\quad -\sum_{j\neq i}\int_{M\backslash B_{x_0}(r)} G\left(x_0, y\right)A_{ij}(y)u^0_j(y)dv_g(y)\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u}_i$ is the C^1_{loc}-limit of the $\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$'s in $\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\hat{\mathcal{S}}$, and G is the Green's function of $\Delta_g + A_{ii}$. Then, letting $r \to 0$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_i(x) &\geq \int_M G\left(x_0, y\right)(u^0_i)^{2^\star-1}(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\quad -\sum_{j\neq i}\int_M G\left(x_0, y\right)A_{ij}(y)u^0_j(y)dv_g(y)\\ &\geq u^0_i(x_0)\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a solution of the limit system (7.3). By (7.69), letting $|x| \to +\infty$, we then get that $K_i \geq u^0_i(x_0)$, and hence that $K_i > 0$ for all i. Since φ_i in (7.36) is given by

$$\varphi_i(x) = \sum_{x_j\in\hat{\mathcal{S}}\backslash\{0\}} \frac{A^i_j}{|x-x_j|^{n-2}} + K_i\ ,$$

and since the A^i_j's are nonnegative, it follows that the φ_i's are positive functions in $B_0(\delta)$ for all i. This proves Step 7.8. □

Clearly Theorem 7.1 follows from Steps 7.1 to 7.8. The proof of Theorem 7.1 proceeds as follows.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. We let the $A(\alpha)$'s be such that (7.2) is satisfied, and let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (7.1) which blows up. By Step 7.6, there exist $\delta > 0$, nonnegative real numbers A_i, and harmonic functions $\varphi_i : B_0(\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that, up to a subsequence, for any i,

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_i(x)$$

in $C^1_{loc}\left(B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the $\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$'s are given by (7.6). By Step 7.7, if we assume that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then at least one of the A_i's is positive. By Step 7.8, if we also assume that the limit system (7.3) is fully coupled, and that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is as in Theorem 4.1, then the φ_i's are positive functions in $B_0(\delta)$ for all i. This ends the proof of Theorem 7.1. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{R} = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i\varphi_i(0)$. By Theorem 7.1, $\mathcal{R} > 0$ if we assume that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, and that the limit system (7.3) is fully coupled. If we drop this assumption that the limit system (7.3) should be fully coupled, and assume only that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α and that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, we might get that $\mathcal{R} = 0$. For instance, if u_0 is a positive solution of the Yamabe equation (1.2) on the unit sphere, and $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a blowing-up sequence of positive solutions of (1.2), then $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_0, u_\alpha)$ is a solution of (7.1) on the unit sphere, where $p = 2$ and $A(\alpha)$ is such that $A^\alpha_{11} = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$, $A^\alpha_{12} = 0$, and $A^\alpha_{22} = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$ for all α. Here $\mathcal{U}^0 = (u_0, 0)$ is not zero. However, $\mathcal{R} = 0$.

8. Standard rescaling

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$. We let also $A(\alpha) = (A^\alpha_{ij})$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A^\alpha_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{8.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists a $C^{0,\theta}$-map $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, such that

$$A^\alpha_{ij} \to A_{ij} \text{ in } C^{0,\theta}(M) \tag{8.2}$$

for all i, j as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \not\equiv 0$, be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (8.1). In particular, the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for (8.1) and we can apply Theorem 4.1. Up to a subsequence, (4.9) and (4.10) hold. In what follows, we assume that the sequence blows up and let the $x^i_{j,\alpha}$'s and $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$'s be the centers and weights of the 1-bubbles $(B^i_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$ in (4.10) from which the p-bubbles $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s in (4.9) are defined, where $i = 1, \dots, p$, $j = 1, \dots, k_i$, and $\sum_i k_i = k$. We fix $i_0 = 1, \dots, p$ and $j_0 = 1, \dots, k_i$ arbitrary. Then, for $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\hat{x}_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\hat{\mu}_\alpha > 0$ by

$$\hat{x}_\alpha = \exp_{x^{i_0}_{j_0,\alpha}}(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x_0) \text{ and } \hat{\mu}_\alpha = \mu^{i_0}_{j_0,\alpha}\ , \tag{8.3}$$

for all α, where the notation $\exp_x$ stands for the exponential map at x. We also define the standard rescaled functions $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$ of the u^i_α's with respect to the $\hat{x}_\alpha$'s and $\hat{\mu}_\alpha$'s, $i = 1, \dots, p$, by

$$\hat{u}^i_\alpha(x) = \hat{\mu}_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^i_\alpha\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x)\right)\ , \tag{8.4}$$

where $x \in B_0(1)$, the $\hat{x}_\alpha$'s and $\hat{\mu}_\alpha$'s are as in (8.3), and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$ for all α. We claim here that the following convergence result holds.

Theorem 8.1 (Standard Rescaling)**.** *Let (M,g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha): M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (8.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (8.1) which blows up. Then there exist $\delta > 0$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, up to a subsequence, for any i,*

$$\hat{u}_\alpha^i \to u_i \text{ in } C^2\left(B_0(\delta)\right) \tag{8.5}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\hat{u}_\alpha^i$ is given by (8.3)–(8.4), and the u_i's are nonnegative (not all trivial) solutions of the Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The u_i's, $i = 1, \ldots, p$, see the discussion at the beginning of Section 4, can be written as

$$u_i(x) = \left(\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i^2 + \frac{|x-x_i|^2}{n(n-2)}}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \tag{8.6}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda_i \geq 0$, and $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. An equivalent statement to the statement that the u_i's are not all trivial is that at least one of the λ_i's is positive.

Proof. First we claim that we can choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x_0| > 0$ small, such that, up to a subsequence,

$$d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right) \geq R\hat{\mu}_\alpha \tag{8.7}$$

for all α and all i, j, where $R > 0$ small is independent of α, i, and j. In order to prove (8.7), we let $\tilde{x}_\alpha = x_{j,\alpha}^i$ when $i = i_0$ and $j = j_0$. Up to passing to a subsequence, we can assume that the ratios $d_g(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i)/\hat{\mu}_\alpha$ have limits (possibly $+\infty$) as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all i, j. We write that

$$\lambda_j^i = \lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \frac{d_g(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha},$$

and let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set consisting of the i, j's such that $\lambda_j^i > 0$. Let $\lambda > 0$ be such that $\lambda < \lambda_j^i$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{H}$. We choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $|x_0| < \lambda/2$. If $i, j \in \mathcal{H}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha} &\geq \frac{d_g\left(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha} - \frac{d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, \tilde{x}_\alpha\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha}\\ &= \frac{d_g\left(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha} - |x_0|\\ &\geq |x_0|\end{aligned}$$

for α large, and we get that (8.7) holds true for any such i, j's. If, on the contrary, $i, j \notin \mathcal{H}$, then $\lambda_j^i = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha} &\geq \frac{d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, \tilde{x}_\alpha\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha} - \frac{d_g\left(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha}\\ &= |x_0| - \frac{d_g\left(\tilde{x}_\alpha, x_{j,\alpha}^i\right)}{\hat{\mu}_\alpha}\\ &\geq \frac{|x_0|}{2}\end{aligned}$$

for α large and, here again, we get that (8.7) holds true. Clearly, this proves that we can choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|x_0| > 0$ small, such that, up to a subsequence, (8.7) is true. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ small such that $2\delta_0 < R$, where $R > 0$ is as in (8.7). By (8.7), we can write that for any $x \in B_0(\delta_0)$, any i, j, and any α,

$$\begin{aligned} d_g\left(x^i_{j,\alpha}, \exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x)\right) &\geq d_g\left(x^i_{j,\alpha}, \hat{x}_\alpha\right) - d_g\left(\hat{x}_\alpha, \exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x)\right) \\ &\geq R\hat{\mu}_\alpha - \delta_0\hat{\mu}_\alpha \\ &\geq \frac{R}{2}\hat{\mu}_\alpha\ . \end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

By Theorem 5.1, it follows from (8.8) that the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s are uniformly bounded in $B_0(\delta_0)$. They are solutions of the system

$$\Delta_{g_\alpha}\hat{u}^i_\alpha + \hat{\mu}^2_\alpha \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}^\alpha_{ij}\hat{u}^j_\alpha = \left(\hat{u}^i_\alpha\right)^{2^\star-1} \tag{8.9}$$

for all i, where

$$g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp^\star_{\hat{x}_\alpha} g\right)(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x) \ \text{ and } \ \hat{A}^\alpha_{ij}(x) = A^\alpha_{ij}\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x)\right)\ .$$

Clearly, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ for any $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where ξ is the Euclidean metric. Then, since the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s are uniformly bounded in $B_0(\delta_0)$, it follows from (8.2), (8.9), and standard elliptic theory, that the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s are uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\theta}\left(B_0(\delta_1)\right)$ for $\delta_1 < \delta_0$, where $0 < \theta < 1$. Up to a subsequence, we may then assume that $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to u_i$ in $C^2\left(B_0(\delta)\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for some $\delta > 0$ small, and all i. By rescaling invariance, the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s are bounded in $H^2_1\left(B_0(R')\right)$ for all $R' > 0$. Up to passing to another subsequence, we may therefore assume that we also have that $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \rightharpoonup v_i$ weakly in $H^2_{1,loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, that $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to v_i$ strongly in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and that $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to v_i$ almost everywhere, for all i. We can also write that

$$\left(\hat{u}^i_\alpha\right)^{2^\star-1} \rightharpoonup \left(v_i\right)^{2^\star-1}$$

weakly in $L^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all i, where $s = 2^\star/(2^\star - 1)$. Then, we get with (8.2) and (8.9) that the v_i's are nonnegative solutions of the Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Clearly, we also have that $v_i = u_i$ in $B_0(\delta)$, for all i. It follows that there exist $\delta > 0$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, up to a subsequence, and for any i,

$$\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to u_i \ \text{ in } C^2\left(B_0(\delta)\right) \tag{8.10}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the u_i's are nonnegative solutions of the Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Now it remains to prove that the u_i's are not all trivial. We prove in what follows that $u_{i_0} \not\equiv 0$, and hence that u_{i_0} is everywhere positive in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Theorem 4.1, given $0 < r < \delta$, we can write that

$$\int_{B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(r\hat{\mu}_\alpha)} \left(u^{i_0}_\alpha\right)^{2^\star} dv_g \geq \int_{B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(r\hat{\mu}_\alpha)} \left(B^{i_0}_{j_0,\alpha}\right)^{2^\star} dv_g + o(1)\ , \tag{8.11}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, and $(B^{i_0}_{j_0,\alpha})_\alpha$ is the 1-bubble of centers the $\tilde{x}_\alpha$'s and weights the $\hat{\mu}_\alpha$'s. By rescaling invariance, and (8.10), we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(r\hat{\mu}_\alpha)} \left(u^{i_0}_\alpha\right)^{2^\star} dv_g &= \int_{B_0(r)} \left(\hat{u}^{i_0}_\alpha\right)^{2^\star} dv_{g_\alpha} \\ &= \int_{B_0(r)} u^{2^\star}_{i_0}\, dx + o(1)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.12}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, since $g_\alpha \to \xi$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Independently,

$$\int_{B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(r\hat{\mu}_\alpha)} (B^{i_0}_{j_0,\alpha})^{2^\star} dv_g = \int_{\Omega_\alpha} u^{2^\star} dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \ , \tag{8.13}$$

where u is given by (4.5), $\hat{g}_\alpha$ is the metric given by $\hat{g}_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp^\star_{\tilde{x}_\alpha} g\right)(\hat{\mu}_\alpha x)$, and

$$\Omega_\alpha = \frac{1}{\mu_\alpha} \exp^{-1}_{\tilde{x}_\alpha}\left(B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(r\hat{\mu}_\alpha)\right) \ .$$

As is easily checked, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $B_{x_0}(t_0) \subset \Omega_\alpha$ for all α. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_\alpha} u^{2^\star} dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} &\geq \int_{B_{x_0}(t_0)} u^{2^\star} dv_{\hat{g}_\alpha} \\ &\geq \int_{B_{x_0}(t_0)} u^{2^\star} dx + o(1) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.14}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, since we also have that $\hat{g}_\alpha \to \xi$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. Combining (8.11)–(8.14), letting $\alpha \to +\infty$, we get that

$$\int_{B_0(r)} u_{i_0}^{2^\star} dx \geq \int_{B_{x_0}(t_0)} u^{2^\star} dx > 0 \ ,$$

and it follows that $u_{i_0} \not\equiv 0$. In particular, the u_i's are not all trivial. Together with (8.10), this ends the proof of Theorem 8.1. □

An easy but important corollary to Theorem 8.1 is as follows.

Corollary 8.1. *Let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (8.2). Let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (8.1) which blows up. For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})} (u^i_\alpha)^2 dv_g \geq C\mu_\alpha^2 \ , \tag{8.15}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$ for all α, and the x_α's and μ_α's are given by (7.4) and (7.5) in Section 7.

Proof. Let x_α and μ_α be given by (7.4) and (7.5). By Theorem 8.1, there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ such that, up to a subsequence, for any i, $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to u_i$ in $C^2(B_0(\delta_0))$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$ is given by

$$\hat{u}^i_\alpha(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^i_\alpha\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \ ,$$

where $\hat{x}_\alpha = \exp_{x_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x_0)$, and the u_i's are nonnegative (not all trivial) solutions of the Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\delta > 0$ be given, and $\delta_1 = \delta_0/2$. Clearly,

$$B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha) \subset B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})$$

for α large. In particular, we can write that, up to a subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})} (u^i_\alpha)^2 dv_g &\geq \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\delta_1\mu_\alpha)} (u^i_\alpha)^2 dv_g \\ &= \mu_\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta_1)} (\hat{u}^i_\alpha)^2 dv_{g_\alpha} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{8.16}$$

where g_α is the metric given by

$$g_\alpha(x) = \left(\exp^\star_{x_\alpha} g\right)(\mu_\alpha x) \ .$$

Clearly, $g_\alpha \to \xi$ in $C^2(K)$ for all $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. We also have that $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to u_i$ in $C^0\left(B_0(\delta_0)\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, for all i. Since the u_i's are not all trivial, so that at least one of the u_i's is a positive function, we can write that, up to a subsequence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta_1)} (\hat{u}^i_\alpha)^2 dv_{g_\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta_1)} u_i^2 dx > 0 \tag{8.17}$$

for all α. Combining (8.16) and (8.17), we get that (8.15) holds true. This proves Corollary 8.1. □

By changing the x_α's in the estimates (7.7) of Theorem 7.1, as in (8.3), we can ask to have both the estimates (8.5) of Theorem 8.1 and the estimates (7.7) of Theorem 7.1. In order to see this, we assume in the sequel that (7.2) holds. We let also μ_α stand for the largest weight among all the possible weights $\mu^i_{j,\alpha}$, and x_α stand for the corresponding $x^i_{j,\alpha}$. Up to renumbering, and up to a subsequence, we can assume that the x_α's and μ_α's correspond to the choice $i = j = 1$. Then (7.4) and (7.5) hold. For $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\hat{x}_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by the first equation in (8.3) when $i_0 = j_0 = 1$. Namely,

$$\hat{x}_\alpha = \exp_{x_\alpha}\left(\mu_\alpha x_0\right) \ , \tag{8.18}$$

and, as in (8.4), we define the standard rescaled function $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$ of u^i_α with respect to $\hat{x}_\alpha$ and $\hat{\mu}_\alpha = \mu_\alpha$ by

$$\hat{u}^i_\alpha(x) = \mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u^i_\alpha\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}(\mu_\alpha x)\right) \ , \tag{8.19}$$

where $x \in B_0(1)$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$. Given $R > 0$, we let $B_0(R)$ be the Euclidean ball centered at 0 of radius R, and let $f_\alpha : B_0(R) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by

$$f_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}} \exp^{-1}_{x_\alpha}\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}\left(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha} x\right)\right) \ , \tag{8.20}$$

where $x \in B_0(R)$, and $\hat{x}_\alpha$ is as in (8.18). It is easily seen that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|f_\alpha(x) - x| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}} d_g(x_\alpha, \hat{x}_\alpha)$$

for all $x \in B_0(R)$ and all α. In particular,

$$\lim_{\alpha \to +\infty} \left(\sup_{x \in B_0(R)} |f_\alpha(x) - x| \right) = 0 \ . \tag{8.21}$$

Choosing $R \gg 1$, we then get with Theorem 7.1 and (8.21) that there exist $\delta > 0$, nonnegative real numbers A_i, and harmonic functions $\varphi_i : B_0(\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that up to a subsequence, for any i,

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) \to \frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}} + \varphi_i(x) \tag{8.22}$$

in $C^0_{loc}\left(B_0(\delta)\backslash\{0\}\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u^1_\alpha, \dots, u^p_\alpha)$, the $\tilde{u}^i_\alpha$'s are the rescaled functions given by

$$\tilde{u}^i_\alpha(x) = u^i_\alpha\left(\exp_{\hat{x}_\alpha}\left(\sqrt{\mu_\alpha} x\right)\right) \ ,$$

$\hat{x}_\alpha$ is as in (8.18), and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary. Independently, by Theorem 8.1, we also have that for a suitable choice of x_0, and for $\delta > 0$ small, $\hat{u}^i_\alpha \to u_i$ in $C^2\left(B_0(\delta)\right)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s are given by (8.19), and the u_i's are nonnegative (non all trivial) solutions of the Euclidean equation $\Delta u = u^{2^\star-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, by slightly changing the x_α's in the estimates of Theorem 7.1, as in (8.18), we can ask to have both the estimates (8.5) of Theorem 8.1 and the estimates (8.22) of Theorem 7.1.

9. Pseudo-compactness and compactness

In what follows we let (M, g) be a smooth compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$, $p \geq 1$ integer, and $\left(A(\alpha)\right)_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$. We let also $A(\alpha) = (A^\alpha_{ij})$, and consider systems like

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A^\alpha_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{9.1}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. We assume that the $A(\alpha)$'s satisfy that there exists a C^1-map $A : M \to M^s_p(\mathbb{R})$, $A = (A_{ij})$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta^p_g + A \text{ is coercive, and} \\ &A^\alpha_{ij} \to A_{ij} \text{ in } C^1(M) \end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where the second equation in (9.2) should hold for all i, j. The limit system we get by combining (9.1) and (9.2) reads as

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^p A_{ij}(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star-2} u_i \tag{9.3}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \dots p$. The goal in this section is to prove compactness results for sequences of nonnegative nontrivial solutions of (9.1). Compactness for second order scalar equations goes back to the remarkable work of Schoen [47, 48, 49] on the Yamabe equation

$$\Delta_g u + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g u = u^{2^\star-1}\ , \tag{9.4}$$

where S_g is the scalar curvature of g. Compactness for scalar curvature type equations was also discussed in Devillanova and Solimini [14], Druet [15, 16], Druet and Hebey [17], Khuri and Schoen [33], Li and Zhu [37], Li and Zhang [35, 36], and Marques [40]. A possible survey reference is Druet and Hebey [18]. We refer also to Druet, Hebey and Robert [19, 20] where the blow-up analysis used in [15] is developed. The dynamical viewpoint, in the sense of the terminology introduced in Hebey [23], where we discuss sequences of equations and not only one equation, is considered in Druet [15], Druet and Hebey [17, 18], and Druet, Hebey and Robert [19, 20]. With this viewpoint, that we also adopt here, several blow-up phenomena can be made concrete in specific examples. In particular, we can construct examples of sequences of solutions with no a priori bound on the energy, or which blow up with an arbitrary number of bubbles in their Sobolev decomposition and an arbitrary number of geometrical blow-up points. In the case of systems, by combining the examples in Druet and Hebey [17] with the construction at the beginning of Section 3, we get that the following result holds.

Proposition 9.1. *Let (M, g) be a space form of positive curvature $+1$, and dimension $n \geq 6$. Let also $s = \pm 1$. There exist sequences $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\tilde{h}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of smooth functions, converging in $C^1(M)$ to $\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$, and sequences $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha)_\alpha$, and $(\beta_\alpha)_\alpha$ of smooth positive functions, converging to 0 in $C^1(M)$, such that the 2-systems (9.1), where $p = 2$ and*

$$A(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} h_\alpha - s\varepsilon_\alpha & s\beta_\alpha \\ s\beta_\alpha & \tilde{h}_\alpha - s\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha \end{pmatrix} , \tag{9.5}$$

are fully coupled, and possess sequences of strictly positive solutions with either no bound on their $H^2_{1,2}$-norm, or which blow up with an arbitrary number of bubbles in their Sobolev decomposition and an arbitrary number of geometrical blow-up points.

By a sequence of solutions which blows up with an arbitrary number of bubbles in its Sobolev decomposition and an arbitrary number of geometrical blow-up points, we mean here that the components of the solutions have an arbitrary number m_i of bubbles in their H^2_1-decomposition (4.10), and that the set of geometrical blow-up points can be chosen with any number $m \leq \sum m_i$ of points. In particular, when $m < \sum m_i$, there are distinct bubbles which accumulate on the same point. Refinements where we also control the number of bubbles which accumulate on a given point are possible. Depending on whether $s = -1$ or $s = +1$, $-A(\alpha)$ or $A(\alpha)$ in (9.5) is cooperative.

Proof. (i) We prove that there are 2-systems like (9.1), where $A(\alpha)$ is as in (9.5), which are fully coupled, and possess sequences of strictly positive solutions which blow up in any possible configuration. We fix m_1, m_2, m, and $s = \pm 1$. Let q_1, q_2 integers such that $m = q_1 + q_2$, $q_1 \leq m_1$, and $q_2 \leq m_2$. By the examples in Druet and Hebey [17], see also [18], there exist sequences $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\tilde{h}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of smooth functions, converging in $C^1(M)$ to $\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$, and sequences $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\tilde{u}_\alpha)_\alpha$ of positive solutions of the scalar equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_g u_\alpha + h_\alpha u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \text{ , and} \\ &\Delta_g \tilde{u}_\alpha + \tilde{h}_\alpha \tilde{u}_\alpha = \tilde{u}_\alpha^{2^\star - 1} \end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

such that the u_α's have m_1 bubbles in their H^2_1-decomposition, and q_1 geometrical blow-up points, and such that the $\tilde{u}_\alpha$'s have m_2 bubbles in their H^2_1-decomposition, and q_2 geometrical blow-up points. We let $(\beta_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of positive functions converging to 0 in $C^1(M)$. We choose the β_α's sufficiently small in the C^1-norm such that $\beta_\alpha v_\alpha \to 0$ and $\beta_\alpha w_\alpha \to 0$ in $C^1(M)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$, where $v_\alpha = u_\alpha / \tilde{u}_\alpha$ and $w_\alpha = \tilde{u}_\alpha / u_\alpha$. Letting the ε_α's and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha$'s be given by

$$\varepsilon_\alpha \frac{u_\alpha}{\tilde{u}_\alpha} = \tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha \frac{\tilde{u}_\alpha}{u_\alpha} = \beta_\alpha \tag{9.7}$$

for all α, the sequences $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$ and $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha)_\alpha$ consist of positive functions and converge to 0 in $C^1(M)$. Moreover, by combining (9.6) and (9.7), we get that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s given by $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha, \tilde{u}_\alpha)$ for all α, are solutions of the 2-systems (9.1), where the $A(\alpha)$'s are as in (9.5), and the sequences $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\tilde{h}_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$, $(\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha)_\alpha$, and $(\beta_\alpha)_\alpha$ are as above. The systems are fully coupled, the components of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s have m_i bubbles in their Sobolev decomposition, and the set of geometrical blow-up points consists of m points. In particular, there are 2-systems like (9.1), where $A(\alpha)$ is as in (9.5), which are fully coupled, and possess sequences of strictly positive solutions which blow up with an arbitrary number of bubbles in their Sobolev decomposition and an arbitrary number of geometrical blow-up points..

(ii) We prove that there are 2-systems like (9.1), where $A(\alpha)$ is as in (9.5), which are fully coupled, and possess sequences of strictly positive solutions with no bound on their $H^2_{1,2}$-norm. By the examples in Druet and Hebey [17], see also [18], there are sequences $(h_\alpha)_\alpha$ of smooth functions, converging in $C^1(M)$ to $\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g$, and sequences $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ of positive solutions of the scalar equations

$$\Delta_g u_\alpha + h_\alpha u_\alpha = u_\alpha^{2^\star-1} , \tag{9.8}$$

such that

$$\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \|u_\alpha\|_{H^2_1} = +\infty .$$

We let $(\varepsilon_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a sequence of positive functions converging to 0 in $C^1(M)$. Letting $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha = \beta_\alpha = \varepsilon_\alpha$, and $\tilde{h}_\alpha = h_\alpha$ for all α, the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s given by $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ for all α, are solutions of the 2-systems (9.1), where the $A(\alpha)$'s are as in (9.5). The systems are fully coupled, and the components of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s have no bound on their H^2_1-norm. In particular, there are 2-systems like (9.1), where $A(\alpha)$ is as in (9.5), which are fully coupled, and possess sequences of strictly positive solutions with no bound on their $H^2_{1,2}$-norm. Together with (i), this ends the proof of the Proposition. $\square$

There are several notions of compactness in the literature. We distinguish two notions in this paper: *pseudo-compactness*, and *compactness*. The family (9.1) is said to be *pseudo-compact* if for any bounded sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nontrivial nonnegative solutions of (9.1) which converges weakly in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$, the weak limit $\mathcal{U}^0$ of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s is not zero, and thus is a nonnegative nontrivial solution of the limit system (9.3). In contrast, we say that the family (9.1) is *compact* if any bounded sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ in $H^2_{1,p}(M)$ of nonnegative solutions of (9.1) is actually bounded in $C^{2,\theta}(M)$, $0<\theta<1$, and thus converges, up to a subsequence, in $C^2(M)$ to some p-map $\mathcal{U}^0$, where the bound in $C^{2,\theta}(M)$ and the convergence in $C^2(M)$ have to be understood for the components of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s and $\mathcal{U}^0$. Because of the examples in Proposition 9.1, we need to assume a bound on the energy in these definitions. In terms of the H^2_1-decomposition

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}^0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha} + \mathcal{R}_\alpha$$

of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s, given by Theorem 4.1, pseudo-compactness reduces to $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$, and, by the pointwise estimates in Section 5 and elliptic theory, compactness reduces to $k=0$. Compactness is clearly a stronger notion than pseudo-compactness. Indeed, by (9.2), we easily get that if $k=0$, then $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$. In order to see this we can write, as in Section 6, that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g &\geq C_1 I_A(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)\\ &\geq C_2 \left(\int_M |\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^{2^\star} dv_g\right)^{2/2^\star} ,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are independent of α, and I_A is given by (2.4). In particular, if the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s are nonzero, then

$$\|\mathcal{U}_\alpha\|_{2^\star} \geq C_3$$

for all α and some $C_3 > 0$ independent of α, so that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$ if $k = 0$. Pseudo-compactness provides the existence of a nontrivial solution of the limit system (9.3). Compactness is closely related to the a priori estimates one needs to prove to develop a Morse theory for systems like (9.1). For minimal energy sequences, as studied in Hebey [25], pseudo-compactness and compactness are one and only one notion. Compactness and a priori estimates for nonlinear (in general subcritical) systems in bounded domains of the Euclidean space, or for the critical Toda system on Riemann surfaces, are discussed in Angenent and Van der Vorst [2, 3], Clément, Manásevich and Mitidieri [10], De Figueiredo [11], Jost, Lin and Wang [32], Jost and Wang [31], Montenegro [42], and Qing [44].

We know from the work of Schoen [47, 48, 49] that the Yamabe equation on manifolds conformally distinct to the sphere is compact. Related references are Druet [16], Khuri and Schoen [33], Li and Zhu [37], Li and Zhang [35, 36], and Marques [40]. A very elegant proof of this compactness result is in Schoen [49] when the manifold is assumed to be conformally flat. In particular, it follows from this result that for manifolds distinct to the sphere, the trivially coupled system consisting of p-copies of the Yamabe equation is compact. We prove here that our systems (9.1) are also compact when their coupling stands far from this trivial coupling. By far we mean here that one of the three following situations occur:

(A1) $A - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g Id_p$ has a sign, or

(A2) $A_{ii} < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$ for all i, or

(A3) $A_{ii} > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g$ for all i,

where A is the limit map in (9.2), S_g is the scalar curvature of g, Id_p is the $p \times p$-identity matrix, and, for $B : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$, we say that B has a sign if either $B(x).(X,X) < 0$ for any $x \in M$ and any $X \in \mathbb{R}^p \backslash \{0\}$, or $B(x).(X,X) > 0$ for any $x \in M$ and any $X \in \mathbb{R}^p \backslash \{0\}$. Because of the dynamical viewpoint we adopted here, and the examples in Proposition 9.1, we need to assume conditions like (A1), (A2), or (A3) in order to get pseudo-compactness or compactness. Actually, it is easily seen that we also need to assume more than (A2) or (A3), as indicated in the remark below.

Remark 9.1: Conditions like (A2) or (A3) alone are not sufficient to guarantee compactness (or pseudo-compactness). Let, for instance, $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a blowing-up sequence of solutions of the Yamabe equation on the sphere, and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ for all α. Let also a, b, c be real numbers such that

$$a + b = b + c = \frac{n(n-2)}{4} ,$$

and $a, c > 0$. Then $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is a blowing-up sequence of solutions of the 2-system

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_0} u + au + bv &= u^{2^\star - 1} \\ \Delta_{g_0} v + bu + cv &= v^{2^\star - 1} , \end{aligned}$$

and we can choose a, b, and c such that the matrix in the system is coercive and either $a, c < \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$, or $a, c > \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$. In the first case $b > 0$, and A is cooperative. In the second case, $b < 0$ and $-A$ is cooperative.

Our compactness result states as follows. With respect to the examples we just discussed in Remark 9.1, the assertions in Theorem 9.1 that the $-A(\alpha)$'s should be cooperative when we assume (A2), or that the $A(\alpha)$'s should be cooperative when we assume (A3), are sharp.

Theorem 9.1 (Compactness)**.** *Let (M,g) be a smooth compact conformally flat Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 4$, $p \geq 1$, and $(A(\alpha))_\alpha$ a sequence of smooth maps $A(\alpha) : M \to M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (9.2). If (A1) holds, then the family (9.1) is pseudo-compact when $n \geq 4$, and compact when $n \geq 7$. If (A2) holds, and the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then the family (9.1) is pseudo-compact when $n \geq 4$, and compact when $n \geq 7$. It is also compact when $n \geq 4$ if we assume in addition that the limit system (9.3) is fully coupled. At last, if (A3) holds, and the $A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then the family (9.1) is pseudo-compact when $n \geq 4$, and compact when $n \geq 7$.*

We prove Theorem 9.1 by proving first the pseudo-compactness part, and then the compactness part of the theorem. For both these parts, the proof is by contradiction. We use in the process the blow-up theory developed in Sections 4 to 8. We also use conformal invariance, and an independent relation given by the Euclidean Pohozaev identity (9.9) below. The key estimate for pseudo-compactness is L^2-concentration in Section 6. The key estimate for compactness is the sharp asymptotic in Section 7. For Ω a smooth bounded domain in the Euclidean space, and u a smooth function in $\overline{\Omega}$, the Pohozaev identity we use in the sequel reads as

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega (x^k\partial_k u)\Delta u dx + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_\Omega u(\Delta u)dx\\ &= -\int_{\partial\Omega}(x^k\partial_k u)\partial_\nu u d\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega}(x,\nu)|\nabla u|^2 d\sigma\\ &\quad - \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{\partial\Omega} u\partial_\nu u d\sigma\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

where Δ is the Euclidean Laplacian, ν is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$, $d\sigma$ is the Euclidean volume element on $\partial\Omega$, and there is a sum over k from 1 to n. We easily get (9.9) by integrating by parts the first term in the left hand side of (9.9). As one can check from the proof of the theorem, see below, the pseudo-compactness part in Theorem 9.1, and the compactness part when $n \geq 7$, are also true if we assume that (A2) holds and $-A$ is cooperative, or that (A3) holds and A is cooperative, where A is the limit of the $A(\alpha)$'s in (9.2).

Proof of Theorem 9.1. We prove Theorem 9.1 by contradiction, and, as already mentionned, we proceed in two steps by proving first the pseudo-compactness part of the theorem, and then the compactness part of the theorem. In what follows, we let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nontrivial nonnegative solutions of (9.1). We assume that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s blow up. Up to a subsequence, we may then write that

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \mathcal{U}^0 + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha} + \mathcal{R}_\alpha\ , \tag{9.10}$$

where $\mathcal{U}^0$ is a weak nonnegative solution of the limit system (9.3), the $(\mathcal{B}_{j,\alpha})_\alpha$'s are p-bubbles, and the $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$'s converge strongly to 0 in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ as $\alpha \to +\infty$. First we prove that, under the assumptions concerning pseudo-compactness in Theorem 9.1, we have that $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$ in (9.10). Then we prove that, under the assumptions concerning compactness in Theorem 9.1, we also get that $k = 0$ in (9.10). We let $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$ be the set consisting of the geometrical blow-up points of the sequence $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$. We let also the u^i_α's be the components of the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. In the first case, when proving pseudo-compactness, we apply (9.9) to the u^i_α's on balls $B_{x_i}(\delta)$, $\delta > 0$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{S}_{geom}$. In the second case, when proving compactness, we apply (9.9) on the smaller balls $B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})$, $\delta > 0$, where μ_α stand for the largest weight among all the possible weights of the bubbles in (9.10), and x_α stand for the corresponding center in (9.10).

Proof of pseudo-compactness. We assume that $\mathcal{U}^0 \equiv 0$ in (9.10). Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{geom}$. Since g is conformally flat, there exist $\delta > 0$ and a conformal metric $\hat{g}$ to g such that $\hat{g}$ is flat in $B_{x_0}(4\delta)$. Let $\hat{g} = \varphi^{4/(n-2)}g$, where φ is smooth and positive, and $\hat{u}^i_\alpha = u^i_\alpha\varphi^{-1}$ for all α and i. By conformal invariance of the conformal Laplacian, see, for instance, Lee and Parker [34], and by (9.1), $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha = (\hat{u}^1_\alpha, \dots, \hat{u}^p_\alpha)$ is a solution of the system

$$\Delta\hat{u}^i_\alpha + \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{A}^\alpha_{ij}\hat{u}^j_\alpha = (\hat{u}^i_\alpha)^{2^\star-1} \tag{9.11}$$

in $B_{x_0}(4\delta)$ for all i and all α, where $\Delta = \Delta_{\hat{g}}$ is the Euclidean Laplacian,

$$\hat{A}^\alpha_{ij} = \frac{1}{\varphi^{2^\star-2}}\left(A^\alpha_{ij} - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}\right) , \tag{9.12}$$

and S_g is the scalar curvature of g. We choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\mathcal{S}_{geom} \cap B_{x_0}(4\delta) = \{x_0\}$. We regard the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s, φ, and the $\hat{A}^\alpha_{ij}$'s as defined in the Euclidean space. Also we assimilate x_0 with 0. The u^i_α's, see Section 5, are uniformly bounded in $C^0_{loc}(M\backslash\mathcal{S}_{geom})$. By the De Giorgi-Nash-Moser iterative scheme in Section 6, it follows that the C^0-norm of the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s in small neighbourhood of $\partial B_0(\delta)$ are controlled by the L^2-norm of the $|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|$'s in annuli like $B_0(2\delta)\backslash B_0(\delta/2)$. By standard elliptic theory, as developed in Gilbarg and Trudinger [22], we then get that for T_δ a sufficiently small neighbourhood of $\partial B_0(\delta)$,

$$\|\hat{u}^i_\alpha\|^2_{C^{1,\theta}(T_\delta)} \le C\int_{B_0(2\delta)\backslash B_0(\delta/2)} |\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2 dx \tag{9.13}$$

for all α and i, where $C > 0$ does not depend on α, $|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2 = \sum_i(\hat{u}^i_\alpha)^2$, and $\theta \in (0,1)$. Let

$$\mathcal{R}^\delta_\alpha = \int_{B_0(2\delta)\backslash B_0(\delta/2)} |\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2 dx . \tag{9.14}$$

By (9.13), plugging the $\hat{u}^i_\alpha$'s in the Pohozaev identity (9.9), with $\Omega = B_0(\delta)$, we can write that

$$\int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k\partial_k\hat{u}^i_\alpha)\Delta\hat{u}^i_\alpha dx + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{B_0(\delta)} \hat{u}^i_\alpha(\Delta\hat{u}^i_\alpha)dx = O\left(\mathcal{R}^\delta_\alpha\right) \tag{9.15}$$

for all α and i, where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta$ is as in (9.14). Combining (9.11) and (9.15), summing over $i = 1, \dots, p$, we then get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{u}_\alpha^i)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star - 1} dx - \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{u}_\alpha^i) \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx \\ &+ \frac{n-2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dx - \frac{n-2}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha \hat{u}_\alpha^i \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx \\ &= O\left(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta\right)\end{aligned} \tag{9.16}$$

for all α, where the $\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha$'s are as in (9.12), and $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta$ is as in (9.14). Integrating by parts, we can write with (9.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{u}_\alpha^i) \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha \hat{u}_\alpha^i \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha) \hat{u}_\alpha^i \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx + O\left(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta\right)\end{aligned} \tag{9.17}$$

for all α, where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta$ is as in (9.14). We can also write that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{u}_\alpha^i)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star - 1} dx \\ &= -\frac{n-2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star} dx + O\left(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta\right)\end{aligned} \tag{9.18}$$

for all α, where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta$ is as in (9.14). In particular, plugging (9.17) and (9.18) in (9.16), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha \hat{u}_\alpha^i \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{B_0(\delta)} (x^k \partial_k \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha) \hat{u}_\alpha^i \hat{u}_\alpha^j dx \\ &= O\left(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta\right)\end{aligned} \tag{9.19}$$

for all α, where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^\delta$ is as in (9.14). By the C^1-convergence in (9.2), the $\partial_k \hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha$'s are uniformly bounded. Coming back to the manifold, noting that $dv_{\hat{g}} = \varphi^{2^\star} dv_g$, and summing over the x_0 in $\mathcal{S}_{geom}$, we get with (9.2), (9.19), and L^2-concentration in Section 6, that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i,j=1}^p \int_{\mathcal{B}_\delta} \left(A_{ij} - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g \delta_{ij}\right) u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g \\ &= \varepsilon_\delta O\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g\right) + o\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \int_M (u_\alpha^i)^2 dv_g\right)\end{aligned} \tag{9.20}$$

for all α, where $\varepsilon_\delta \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$, the first term in the right hand side of (9.20) depends on δ only by ε_δ, the A_{ij}'s are the components of the limit map A given by

(9.2), and

$$\mathcal{B}_\delta = \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{S}_{geom}} B_x(\delta)\ .$$

If we assume that (A1) holds, then either $A_{ij} > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}$ or $A_{ij} < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}$ in the sense of bilinear forms. In both cases, it follows from (9.20) and L^2-concentration that there exists $C > 0$, independent of α and δ, such that

$$C\sum_{i=1}^p\int_M(u_\alpha^i)^2dv_g \le \varepsilon_\delta O\left(\sum_{i=1}^p\int_M(u_\alpha^i)^2dv_g\right) + o\left(\sum_{i=1}^p\int_M(u_\alpha^i)^2dv_g\right) \tag{9.21}$$

for all α, where $\varepsilon_\delta \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. If we assume that the $A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative, then, by (9.2), A is also cooperative. In particular, $A_{ij}u_\alpha^iu_\alpha^j \ge 0$ for $i \neq j$, and if we assume in addition that (A3) holds, then we get here again that there exists $C > 0$, independent of α and δ, such that (9.21) holds for all α. The same conclusion (9.21) holds if we assume (A2) and that $-A$ is, or that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are, cooperative. Taking $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, the contradiction follows from (9.21). In particular, $\mathcal{U}^0 \not\equiv 0$ in (9.10), and this ends the proof of the pseudo-compactness part of Theorem 9.1. □

Proof of compactness. We let the x_α's and μ_α's be given by (7.4) and (7.5) in Section 7. We let also $\delta > 0$ small be less than the δ given by Theorem 7.1. Since g is conformally flat, there exists a conformal metric $\hat{g}$ to g such that $\hat{g}$ is flat in $B_{x_0}(4\delta)$, where x_0 is the limit of the x_α's. We let $\hat{g} = \varphi^{4/(n-2)}g$, where φ is smooth, positive, and such that $\varphi(x_0) = 1$, and let $\hat{u}_\alpha^i = u_\alpha^i\varphi^{-1}$ for all α and i. By conformal invariance of the conformal Laplacian, and by (9.1), equation (9.11) holds in $B_{x_0}(4\delta)$ for all α and all i. Namely,

$$\Delta\hat{u}_\alpha^i + \sum_{j=1}^p\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^j = (\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1}$$

in $B_{x_0}(4\delta)$ for all i and all α, where $\Delta = \Delta_{\hat{g}}$ is the Euclidean Laplacian, and the $\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha$'s are given by (9.12). In what follows we assimilate x_α with $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (thanks to the exponential map at x_α). We also regard the $\hat{u}_\alpha^i$'s, φ, and the $\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha$'s in (9.11) as defined in the Euclidean space. Plugging the $\hat{u}_\alpha^i$'s in the Pohozaev identity (9.9), with $\Omega = B_0(\delta\mu_\alpha)$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\Delta\hat{u}_\alpha^idx + \frac{n-2}{2}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{u}_\alpha^i(\Delta\hat{u}_\alpha^i)dx\\ &= -\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^id\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)|\nabla\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^2d\sigma\\ &\quad -\frac{n-2}{2}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{u}_\alpha^i\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^id\sigma\end{aligned} \tag{9.22}$$

for all α and i. Combining (9.11) and (9.22), summing over $i = 1, \ldots, p$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1}dx - \sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx\\
&+\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star}dx - \frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx\\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^i d\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)|\nabla\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^2 d\sigma\\
&\quad -\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{u}_\alpha^i\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^i d\sigma
\end{aligned}\tag{9.23}$$

for all α. Integrating by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star-1}dx\\
&= -\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star}dx + \frac{n-2}{2n}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star}d\sigma\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{9.24}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx\\
&= -\frac{n}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha)\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx\\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j d\sigma
\end{aligned}\tag{9.25}$$

for all α. By (9.2), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star}d\sigma = o\left(\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^{2^\star}d\sigma\right)\ ,\text{ and}\\
&\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx = o\left(\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2 d\sigma\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for all α, i, and j, where $|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^q = \sum_i |\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^q$. By Theorem 7.1, and the change of variables $x = \sqrt{\mu_\alpha}y$, we also have that

$$\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^q d\sigma = O\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\right)$$

for all α, and all $q = 2, 2^\star$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)(\hat{u}_\alpha^i)^{2^\star}d\sigma = o\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\right)\ ,\text{ and}\\
&\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx = o\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{9.26}$$

for all α, i, and j. By the C^1-convergence in (9.2),

$$\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha)\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx = o\left(\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2dx\right) \tag{9.27}$$

for all α, i, and j. By (9.23)–(9.27), we then get that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j=1}^p\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}&\hat{A}_{ij}^\alpha\hat{u}_\alpha^i\hat{u}_\alpha^j dx + o\left(\int_{B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\hat{\mathcal{U}}_\alpha|^2dx\right)+o\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\right)\\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x^k\partial_k\hat{u}_\alpha^i)\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^i d\sigma+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(x,\nu)|\nabla\hat{u}_\alpha^i|^2d\sigma\\ &\quad-\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\hat{u}_\alpha^i\partial_\nu\hat{u}_\alpha^i d\sigma\end{aligned} \tag{9.28}$$

for all α. In what follows we let $\mathcal{R}_{HS}(\alpha)$ be the right hand side in (9.28). By the change of variables $x=\sqrt{\mu_\alpha}y$, by Theorem 7.1, and since we assumed that $\varphi(x_0)=1$, we can write that

$$\lim_{\alpha\to+\infty}\mu_\alpha^{-\frac{n-2}{2}}\mathcal{R}_{HS}(\alpha)=\mathcal{R}\ , \tag{9.29}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}=&-\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta)}(x^k\partial_k\tilde{u}_i)\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_i d\sigma+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta)}(x,\nu)|\nabla\tilde{u}_i|^2d\sigma\\ &-\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(\delta)}\tilde{u}_i\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_i d\sigma\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{9.30}$$

and where, for $i=1,\dots,p$, the $\tilde{u}_i$'s are the limits of the $\tilde{u}_\alpha^i$'s given by Theorem 7.1. In particular,

$$\tilde{u}_i(x)=\frac{A_i}{|x|^{n-2}}+\varphi_i(x) \tag{9.31}$$

for all i, where $A_i\geq 0$, and φ_i is harmonic in an open ball $B_0(\delta')$, $\delta'>\delta$. We clearly have that $\Delta\tilde{u}_i=0$ in $B_0(\delta')\backslash\{0\}$. Applying the Pohozaev identity (9.9) to the $\tilde{u}_i$'s in annuli like $B_0(\delta)\backslash B_0(r)$, where $0<r<\delta$, and letting $r\to 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}=\lim_{r\to 0}\Bigg[&-\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(r)}(x^k\partial_k\tilde{u}_i)\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_i d\sigma+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(r)}(x,\nu)|\nabla\tilde{u}_i|^2d\sigma\\ &-\frac{n-2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^p\int_{\partial B_0(r)}\tilde{u}_i\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_i d\sigma\Bigg]\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{9.32}$$

and by (9.31), we can write with (9.32) that $\mathcal{R}=\frac{(n-2)^2}{2}\omega_{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^p A_i\varphi_i(0)$, where ω_{n-1} is the volume of the unit $(n-1)$-sphere. We have that $dv_{\hat{g}}=\varphi^{2^\star}dv_g$. By (9.28)–(9.29), and also by (9.2), we then get, by coming back to the manifold, that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i,j=1}^{p}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}\left(A_{ij}-\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}\right)u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j dv_g\\&+o\left(\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2dv_g\right)=\frac{(n-2)^2}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}A_i\varphi_i(0)+o(1)\right)\omega_{n-1}\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\end{aligned}\tag{9.33}$$

for all α, where the A_i's and φ_i's are given by Theorem 7.1, the A_{ij}'s are the components of the limit map A given by (9.2), $o(1)\to 0$ as $\alpha\to+\infty$, and ω_{n-1} is the volume of the unit $(n-1)$-sphere. Now, if we assume that (A1) holds, then either $A_{ij}>\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}$ or $A_{ij}<\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}S_g\delta_{ij}$ in the sense of bilinear forms. In both cases, it follows from (9.33) that there exists $C>0$, independent of α, such that

$$C\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}(u_\alpha^i)^2dv_g=O\left(\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\right)\tag{9.34}$$

for all α. When $n\geq 7$, $\frac{n-2}{2}>2$ so that $\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}=o\left(\mu_\alpha^2\right)$, and the contradiction follows from (9.34) and Corollary 8.1. If we assume that the $A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative, then, by (9.2), A is also cooperative. In particular, $A_{ij}u_\alpha^i u_\alpha^j\geq 0$ for $i\neq j$, and if we assume in addition that (A3) holds, then we get here again that there exists $C>0$, independent of α and δ, such that (9.34) holds for all α. The same conclusion (9.34) holds if we assume (A2) and that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative. Here again, the contradiction follows from (9.34) and Corollary 8.1 when the dimension $n\geq 7$. In particular, $\mathcal{U}^0\not\equiv 0$ and $k=0$ in (9.10). Now we assume that $n\geq 4$, that (A2) holds, that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, and that the limit system (9.3) is fully coupled. By (9.34), since we assumed (A2) and that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, there exists $C>0$, independent of α, such that

$$C\int_{B_{x_\alpha}(\delta\sqrt{\mu_\alpha})}|\mathcal{U}_\alpha|^2dv_g+\frac{(n-2)^2}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{p}A_i\varphi_i(0)+o(1)\right)\omega_{n-1}\mu_\alpha^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\leq 0\tag{9.35}$$

for all α. By the pseudo-compactness we proved above, we also have that $\mathcal{U}^0$ in (9.10) is nonzero when $n\geq 4$. Then, by Theorem 7.1, since we assumed that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α and that the limit system (9.3) is fully coupled, we can write that $\sum_{i=1}^{p}A_i\varphi_i(0)>0$, and the contradiction follows from (9.35). This proves the compactness part of Theorem 9.1. □

Summarizing, we let $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a bounded sequence in $H_{1,p}^2(M)$ of nontrivial nonnegative solutions of (9.1). We assume that the $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s blow up and, up to a subsequence, that the decomposition (9.10) is true. By the first part of the proof, the pseudo-compactness part, if (A1) holds, or (A2) holds and the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, or (A3) holds and the $A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, then $\mathcal{U}^0$ in (9.10) is nonzero when $n\geq 4$. By the second part of the proof, the compactness part, we also get that $k=0$ when the dimension $n\geq 7$ if (A1) holds, or (A2) holds and the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, or (A3) holds and the $A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α. Moreover, when $n\geq 4$, still by the second part of the proof, if we assume that (A2) holds, that the $-A(\alpha)$'s are cooperative for all α, and that the limit system (9.3) is fully coupled, then, we again get that $k=0$ in (9.10). Since $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_\alpha$ is arbitrary, this ends the proof of Theorem 9.1. □

One more remark with respect to Theorem 9.1 is as follows.

Remark 9.2: We have already mentionned, in Remark 9.1 just before stating Theorem 9.1, that we cannot get compactness or pseudo-compactness for systems like (9.1) if we only assume (A2) or (A3). In the same spirit, we mention that, without further assumptions, we cannot hope as well to get compactness or pseudo-compactness with a mix of conditions like (A2) and (A3) on the diagonal of the limit matrix A. Let, for instance, $(u_\alpha)_\alpha$ be a blowing-up sequence of solutions of the Yamabe equation on the sphere, and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = (u_\alpha, u_\alpha, u_\alpha)$ for all α. Let also A be the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ b & c & -d \\ 0 & -d & e \end{pmatrix} , \tag{9.36}$$

where a, b, c, d, e are positive real numbers. If $\lambda_n = \frac{n(n-2)}{4}$, hence $\lambda_n = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{g_0}$, we choose a, b, c, d, e such that $a + b = \lambda_n$, $b + c = d + \lambda_n$, and $e = d + \lambda_n$. For any α, the map $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ is a positive solution of the 3-system

$$\Delta_{g_0} u^i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij} u^j = (u^i)^{2^\star - 1}$$

in S^n, for all $i = 1, 2, 3$, where the A_{ij}'s are the components of the matrix A in (9.36). The u_α's blow up with a zero (pointwise) limit. It follows that the system is not pseudo-compact (and thus, not compact as well). However, by choosing $d < b$ sufficiently small, the operator $\Delta_{g_0}^3 + A$ is coercive, $A_{ii} < \lambda_n$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $A_{33} > \lambda_n$. Compactness when we mix conditions like (A2) and (A3) on the diagonal is false in general. We get compactness type behaviour under such assumptions when the energy of the sequence is of minimal type, see Hebey [25], or, of course, if we assume that $A_{ij}^\alpha \equiv 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and all α.

The following easy corollary of Theorem 9.1 shows that the theorem is sharp when regarded on the unit sphere. Corollary 9.1 below states that the trivially coupled system on the sphere, consisting of p copies of the Yamabe equation, is, in some sense, the only system on the sphere which is not compact. Concerning notations, we let (S^n, g_0) be the unit n-sphere, and $A : S^n \to M_p^s(S^n)$ be a smooth map. We assume that $A(x)$ is positive in the sense of bilinear forms for all $x \in S^n$, and for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$A_t = \frac{n(n-2)}{4} Id_p + tA , \tag{9.37}$$

where Id_p is the $p \times p$-identity matrix in $M_p^s(\mathbb{R})$. We let Λ_0 be the maximum over $i = 1, \ldots, p$ and $x \in S^n$ of the eigenvalues $\lambda_i(x)$ of $A(x)$. The operator $\Delta_g^p + A_t$ is coercive for all t in the interval $I_0 = (-\Lambda, +\infty)$, where $4\Lambda_0\Lambda = -n(n-2)$. For $t \in I_0 = (-\Lambda, +\infty)$, where $4\Lambda_0\Lambda = -n(n-2)$, we consider the systems

$$\Delta_g u_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_{ij}^t(x) u_j = |u_i|^{2^\star - 2} u_i \tag{9.38}$$

in M, for all $i = 1, \ldots p$, where the A_{ij}^t's are the components of A_t, and A_t is given by (9.37). Corollary 9.1 isolates the trivially coupled system on the sphere as the only system for which pseudo-compactness or compactness fails in families of systems like (9.38), providing an illustration that blow-up phenomena and noncompactness occur only with the geometric equation (in the case of the sphere), or perturbations of the geometric equation (by Proposition 9.1).

Corollary 9.1. *Let* (S^n, g_0) *be the unit* n*-sphere, and* $A : S^n \to M_p^s(S^n)$ *be a smooth map such that* $A(x)$ *is positive in the sense of bilinear forms for all* $x \in S^n$*. For any* $t \in I_0 \backslash \{0\}$*, where* $I_0 = (-\Lambda, +\infty)$ *is as above, the system (9.38) is pseudo-compact when* $n \geq 4$*, and compact when* $n \geq 7$*. On the other hand, when* $t = 0$*, (9.38) is neither compact nor pseudo-compact. In particular, the trivially coupled system (9.38) when* $t = 0$*, corresponding to* p*-copies of the Yamabe equation on the sphere, is the only system in the family (9.38),* $t > -\Lambda$*, which is not compact, respectively not pseudo-compact (depending on whether* $n \geq 4$ *or* $n \geq 7$*).*

Pseudo-compactness and compactness in the corollary follow from Theorem 9.1. Since we assumed that $A(x)$ is positive in the sense of bilinear forms for all $x \in S^n$, (A1) holds for the A_t's when $t \neq 0$ and we can apply the theorem. On the other hand, that (9.38) is neither compact nor pseudo-compact when $t = 0$ follows from the observation that (9.38) when $t = 0$ consists of p-copies of the Yamabe equation on the sphere which, as is well known, possesses sequences of solutions which blow up with one bubble and a zero (pointwise) limit in their Sobolev decomposition.

Acknowledgements: The author is indebted to Olivier Druet and Frédéric Robert for their valuable comments on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

[1] Amster, P., De Nápoli, P., and Mariani, M.C., Existence of solutions for elliptic systems with critical Sobolev exponent, *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 49, 2002, 1–13.

[2] Angenent, S.B., and Van der Vorst, R., A superquadratic indefinite elliptic system and its Morse-Conley-Floer homology, S.B. Angenent and R. C. A. M. Van der Vorst, *Math. Z.*, 231, 1999, 203–248.

[3] ———, A priori bounds and renormalized Morse indices of solutions of an elliptic system, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré. Anal. Non Linéaire*, 17, 2000, 277–306.

[4] Aubin, T., Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 55, 1976, 269–296.

[5] ———, *Nonlinear analysis on manifolds. Monge-Ampère equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 252, Springer, New York–Berlin, 1982.

[6] Brézis, H., and Coron, J.M., Convergence of solutions of H-systems or how to blow bubbles, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 89, 1985, 21–56.

[7] Brézis, H., and Lieb, E., A relation between pointwise convergence of functions and convergence of functionals, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 88, 1983, 486–490.

[8] Caffarelli, L. A., Gidas, B., and Spruck, J., Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 42, 1989, 271–297.

[9] Chavel, I., *Riemannian geometry—a modern introduction.* Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 108, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[10] Clément, P., Manásevich, R., and Mitidieri, E., Positive solutions for a quasilinear system via blow up, *Commun. in Partial Differential Equations*, 18, 1993, 2071–2106.

[11] De Figueiredo, D.G., Semilinear elliptic systems, *Nonlinear functional analysis and applications to differential equations*, Trieste 1997, 122–152, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1998.

[12] De Figueiredo, D.G., and Ding, Y.H., Strongly indefinite functionals and multiple solutions of elliptic systems, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355, 2003, 2973–2989.

[13] De Figueiredo, D.G., and Felmer, P.L., On superquadratic elliptic systems, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 343, 1994, 97–116.

[14] Devillanova, G. and Solimini, S., Concentration estimates and multiple solutions to elliptic problems at critical growth, *Adv. Differential Equations*, 7, 2002, 1257-1280.

[15] Druet, O., , From one bubble to several bubbles: The low-dimensional case, *J. Differential Geom.*, 63, 2003, 399–473.

[16] ———, Compactness for Yamabe metrics in low dimensions, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 23, 2004, 1143–1191.

[17] Druet, O., and Hebey, E. , Blow-up examples for second order elliptic PDEs of critical Sobolev growth, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357, 2004, 1915–1929.

[18] ———, Elliptic equations of Yamabe type, *International Mathematics Research Surveys*, 1, 2005, 1–113.

[19] Druet, O., Hebey, E., and Robert, F., A C^0-theory for the blow-up of second order elliptic equations of critical Sobolev growth, *Electronic Research Announcements of the AMS*, 9, 2003, 19–25.

[20] ———, *Blow-up theory for elliptic PDEs in Riemannian geometry*, Mathematical Notes, Princeton University Press, vol. 45, 2004.

[21] El Hamidi, A., Existence results to ellipttic systems with nonstandard growth conditions, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, To appear.

[22] Gilbarg, G., and Trudinger, N.S., *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Second edition, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 224, Springer, Berlin–New York, 1983.

[23] Hebey, E. , *Nonlinear elliptic equations of critical Sobolev growth from a dynamical viewpoint*, in "Noncompact Problems at the Intersection of Geometry, Analysis, and Topology", Contemporary Mathematics, A. Bahri, S. Klainerman, and M. Vogelius Eds., 350, 2004, 115–125.

[24] ———, Courbure scalaire et géométrie conforme, *J. Geom. Phys.*, 10, 1993, 345-380.

[25] ———, Sharp Sobolev inequalities for vector valued maps, *Preprint*, 2005.

[26] Hebey, E., Robert, F., and Wen, Y., Compactness and global estimates for a fourth order equation of critical Sobolev growth arising from conformal geometry, *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, To appear.

[27] Hebey, E., and Vaugon, M., Meilleures constantes dans le théorème d'inclusion de Sobolev et multiplicité pour les problèmes de Nirenberg et Yamabe, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 41, 1992, 377–407.

[28] ———, The best constant problem in the Sobolev embedding theorem for complete Riemannian manifolds, *Duke Math. J.*, 79, 1995, 235–279.

[29] ———, Meilleures constantes dans le théorème d'inclusion de Sobolev, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré. Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13, 1996, 57–93.

[30] Hulshof, J., Mitidieri, E., and Vandervorst, R., Strongly indefinite systems with critical Sobolev exponents, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 350, 1998, 2349–2365.

[31] Jost, J., and Wang, G., Analytic aspects of the Toda system: I. A Moser-Trudinger inequality, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54, 2001, 1289–1319.

[32] Jost, J., Lin, C.S., and Wang, G., Analytic aspects of the Toda system: II. Bubbling behavior and existence of solutions, *Preprint*, 2005.

[33] Khuri, M., and Schoen, R., Global bounds and new existence theorems for the Yamabe problem, *In preparation*, 2005.

[34] Lee, J. M., and Parker, T. H., The Yamabe problem, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 17, 1987, 37–91.

[35] Li, Y.Y., and Zhang, L., A Harnack type inequality for the Yamabe equations in low dimensions, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 20, 2004, 133–151.

[36] ———, Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 338, 2004, 693–695.

[37] Li, Y.Y., and Zhu, M., Yamabe type equations on three dimensional Riemannian manifolds, *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 1, 1999, 1–50.

[38] Lions, P.-L., The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations, The limit case I, II, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, no. 1, 145-201; no. 2, 45–121, 1985.

[39] Mancini, G., and Mitidieri, E., Positive solutions of some coercive-anticoercive elliptic systems, *Annales faculté des sciences de Toulouse*, 8, 1986/87, 257–292.

[40] Marques, F.C., A priori estimates for the Yamabe problem in the non-locally conformally flat case, *Preprint*, 2004.

[41] Mitidieri, E., and Sweers, G., Weakly coupled elliptic systems and positivity, *Math. Nachr.*, 173, 1995, 259–286.

[42] Montenegro, M.S., Criticalidade, superlinearidade e sublinearidade para sistemas elíptico semilineares, *Tese de Doutoramento*, Unicamp, 1997.

[43] Obata, M., The conjectures on conformal transformations of Riemannian manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.*, 6, 1971/72, 247–258.

[44] Qing, J., A priori estimates for positive solutions of semi-linear elliptic systems, *J. Partial Differential Equations*, 1, 1988, 61–70.

[45] Sacks, P., and Uhlenbeck, K., On the existence of minimal immersions of 2-spheres, *Ann. Math.*, 113, 1981, 1–24.

[46] Schoen, R.M., Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature, *J. Differential Geometry*, 20, 1984, 479–495.

[47] ———, *Lecture notes from courses at Stanford*, written by D.Pollack, preprint, 1988.

[48] ———, *Variational theory for the total scalar curvature functional for Riemannian metrics and related topics*, Topics in Calculus of Variations (Montecatini Terme, 1987), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1365, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989, 120–154.

[49] ———, On the number of constant scalar curvature metrics in a conformal class, Differential Geometry: A Symposium in Honor of Manfredo do Carmo, Proc. Int. Conf. (Rio de Janeiro, 1988). *Pitman Monogr. Surveys Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 52, Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1991, 311–320.

[50] ———, A report on some recent progress on nonlinear problems in geometry, Surveys in Differential Geometry (Cambridge, 1990), *Suppl. J. Diff. Geom.*, vol. 1, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, 1991, 201–241.

[51] Struwe, M., A global compactness result for elliptic boundary value problems involving limiting nonlinearities, *Math. Z.*, 187, 1984, 511–517.

[52] Sweers, G., Strong positivity in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ for elliptic systems, *Math. Z.*, 209, 1992, 251–271.

[53] Trudinger, N.S., Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, 22, 1968, 265–274.

[54] Veron, L., *Singularities of solutions of second order quasilinear equations*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematical Series, Addison Wesley Longman Lim., Harlow, 1996.

[55] Wente, H. C., Large solutions to the volume constrained Plateau problem, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 75, 1980, 59–77.

[56] Yamabe, H., On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, *Osaka Math. J.*, 12, 1960, 21–37.

Emmanuel Hebey, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Département de Mathématiques, Site de Saint-Martin, 2 avenue Adolphe Chauvin, 95302 Cergy-Pontoise cedex, France
E-mail address: `Emmanuel.Hebey@math.u-cergy.fr`